

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters on the Calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the Calendar.

RECESS

The Senate resumed legislative session.

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 25, 1936, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 24, 1936

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Leo J. Voell, of Wisconsin, to be State director of the Public Works Administration in Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

George E. Miller, of Iowa, to be United States marshal, southern district of Iowa, vice Fred S. Hird, term expired.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be first lieutenant with rank from date of appointment

First Lt. Bryan Coleman Thomas Fenton, Medical Corps Reserve.

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Maj. Philip Blaine Fryer, Cavalry, with rank from November 1, 1933.

TO CAVALRY

Maj. Vennard Wilson, Ordnance Department, with rank from August 1, 1935, effective June 20, 1936.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

First Lt. Randolph Bolling Hubbard, Infantry, with rank from December 1, 1934.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

CHAPLAINS

To be chaplain with the rank of captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) William John Walsh, United States Army, from February 13, 1936.

Chaplain (First Lt.) James Gordon De La Vergne, United States Army, from February 13, 1936.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

GENERAL OFFICER

To be brigadier general, Adjutant General's Department, National Guard of the United States, from February 21, 1936, under the provisions of section 38 of the National Defense Act as amended

Brig. Gen. John Aloysius O'Keefe, Adjutant General's Department, Mississippi National Guard.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, February 24, 1936

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

George D. Andrews to be State director of the Public Works Administration in Pennsylvania.

Kenneth W. Markwell to be State director of the Public Works Administration in Tennessee.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Ralph L. Emmons to be United States attorney, northern district of New York.

PROMOTIONS IN THE COAST GUARD

James L. Ahern to be captain.

Carl C. von Paulsen to be commander.

Fletcher W. Brown to be commander.

John E. Whitbeck to be commander.

Donald G. Jacobs to lieutenant commander.

Chester L. Harding to be lieutenant (junior grade).

Roy E. Stockstill to be lieutenant (junior grade).

Harold B. Roberts to be lieutenant (junior grade).

James R. Hinnant to be lieutenant (junior grade).

Richard C. Foutter to be lieutenant (junior grade).

Charles O. Ashley to be lieutenant (junior grade).

Quentin McK. Greeley to be lieutenant (junior grade).

Randolph Ridgely, III, to be lieutenant (junior grade).

Arthur M. Root, Jr., to be lieutenant (junior grade).

John T. Stanley to be lieutenant (junior grade).

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Marcus Watson Miller, Colquitt.

Carl M. Simonton, Franklin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of life, below, above, let us keep silence before Thee. We thank Thee that each new day is a fresh witness of Thy loving kindness. At its threshold inspire us to rise out of our incomplete selves into conscious kinship with Thee. Animated by Thy spirit, give us sympathetic words to cheer and willing minds to minister. Walk with us through the untrodden paths of duty and service, guarding our country's honor as our own. Heavenly Father, we pray for Thy guidance; do Thou keep us from temptation as we meet the tests of personal responsibility; bless us with the inward spiritual triumph. We beseech Thee, blessed Lord, that our honored and beloved Speaker, with the entire Congress, may solve real problems and escape from real perplexities. Strengthen all of us with inner steadiness and serene minds. Bless us with new revelations of victorious living. Through Christ, our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 22, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11138. An act to extinguish tax liabilities and tax liens arising out of the Tobacco, Cotton, and Potato Acts.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3780) entitled "An act to promote the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources by temporary Federal aid to farmers and by providing for a permanent policy of Federal aid to States for such purposes", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SMITH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. POPE, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. FRAZIER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 3521) to authorize an exchange of land between the Waianae Co. and the Navy Department.

JUSTICE WILLIAM W. POTTER, OF MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, it is with great reluctance that I rise today to speak to you on the subject which I shall discuss. I represent the Twelfth Congressional District of Michigan. I am proud of my district, and I am proud of my State, and so it is with reluctance that I call to the attention of the people of the Nation and to the attention, particularly, of the citi-

zens of Michigan the activities of one William W. Potter, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

In preface to my remarks I might state that I have been a member in good standing of the bar of Michigan for a number of years past. I have had the honor to practice before the supreme court in Michigan, and I have high regard for the supreme bench in Michigan as a judicial body. I expect to try additional cases before our supreme court, but I cannot let that fact deter me from what appears to me my clear duty as a citizen of Michigan and Representative in Congress of a part of her people.

The courts in our democracy have traditionally been regarded as the one great branch of our Government that is and should be free from the taint of politics and partisanship. It is in the very spirit of the Constitution of the United States and of the Constitution of Michigan that our judicial branch of Government must be untrammelled and that our judges must remain free from entanglement in partisan political strife. Any condition other than this is unthinkable in a free democracy. This, I believe, is fully understood.

We in upper Michigan have been treated during the past 10 days to a most amazing spectacle. Justice William W. Potter, of our supreme court, has made a tour of the Twelfth District, a tour for the purpose of delivering a series of the most brazen and ill-considered partisan political speeches that have ever come to my attention.

I have no objection to a judge from any bench speaking to any group. I admit that our judges will have definite political philosophies, but I contend again that there is no judge of any court worthy of the name who will enter the political arena and openly champion the cause of a particular political party.

Lest I be accused of exaggeration as to the activities of Justice Potter, allow me to quote to you from press reports of his speeches. A headline appears in the Marquette Mining Journal, of Marquette, Mich., for February 12, 1936: "New Deal 'Incompetent dictatorship', Justice Potter charges at Ishpeming." "Sound sense is G. O. P. goal, he declares." In the Evening Copper Journal of Hancock, Mich., for February 14, the headline reads: "Potter lashes New Deal in address here." In the Houghton Mining Gazette, of Houghton, Mich., the report of the justice's address was labeled "Potter assails regimentation."

One might well inquire what organization or organizations sponsored this intemperate, political speech-making justice. Or, perhaps you can guess. In Marquette County the honor belongs to the Lincoln Republican Club. In Houghton County the young Republicans take the responsibility.

The eminent Justice Potter placed no restraints upon himself. The New Deal, he said, was a raw deal. The Democratic administration was accused of repressive planning, subversive policies, soviet regimentation, and carried the menace of irresponsible dictatorship. The "brain trust", according to the justice, was made up of perverted intellects.

I need not quote further. Full reports on the justice's speeches are available in my office to anyone who wishes the entire account of his degradation. Justice Potter has violated one of the cardinal, ethical principles of judicial activity. He has stooped to the last resort of an unprincipled politician. Mud slinger, rather than Justice Potter will be his title to every citizen in Michigan who respects our judiciary. Justice Potter has lowered himself to crawl with the vermin which inhabit the mud which he has slung. The headlines of his addresses should have read, "Justice of supreme court descends to demagoguery", or "Michigan Supreme Court fouled by Justice Potter."

In his speeches, Justice Potter had the temerity to speak of constitutional government and the necessity for its protection from the communistic members of the Democratic Party. I submit that the justice lacks an intelligent understanding of constitutional government. Justice Potter's political activity is, in itself, a more flagrant violation of the principles of constitutional government than any action called to my attention in recent times. When the body of a politician hides behind the dignity of a judicial robe, and

when the mouth of a politician speaks from the mask of judicial nonpartisanship, then it is time to rise in protection of our democratic institutions. That this should have happened in Michigan brings shame to the cheek of every loyal citizen of our State.

Justice Potter is not alone responsible for the degradation of our judiciary. Those Republican organizations who invited Justice Potter to deliver his political diatribes, are also to be held accountable. The scorn of public opinion is also to be directed against them and their unscrupulous attempts to use a member of our supreme court to bolster up the declining fortunes of their party. If conservatism has indeed entrenched itself in our judiciary, it is well that we are made aware of that fact. When such a situation exists, who can say that our courts are not open to criticism? When State supreme court justices deliver political stump speeches, criticism is not only justified, but absolutely essential. Entrenched greed working through the Republican Party will stoop to any means to regain a privileged position in our Government. The case of Justice Potter is ample proof of this.

Not only did Justice Potter defile his position by openly taking part in partisan political activity, but his statements lead one to question either his intelligence or his veracity. Many of his utterances are so patently fallacious that they would be humorous if the precedent he has established were not so fraught with danger to our liberty and justice. Mr. Potter—he should not be called justice—charged the Democratic administration with buying German steel for use in Federal-construction projects in New York. The justice failed to acquaint himself with the facts. The Government, itself, never entered into any contract with a German steel company. And the only reason any consideration was given to the foreign product at all by the borrowing agencies in New York was because no American steel company produced the steel piling required for the job—and the reason that United States Steel and the rest of them did not make this piling was because there was not enough profit in it for them. Since the controversy over the case of the German steel, it might be called to Justice Potter's attention, the American mills have started to roll this type of steel.

The justice stated, too, that the United States now has the greatest deficit of any nation in the world. He might be corrected by having pointed out to him that the per-capita debt in England is, roughly, three times that in the United States.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman has made a very severe criticism of Judge Potter, who stands very high in the State of Michigan. In the last analysis I wonder if the gentleman's only complaint against Judge Potter is that he did not make Democratic speeches at these Republican meetings to which the gentleman has referred?

Mr. HOOK. My criticism of him is that any justice who will defile the bench should not enter politics. These are simply examples of the misinformation in Justice Potter's speeches.

I have spoken of Justice Potter in this manner out of respect to the good citizens of Michigan and of the United States. The honest and decent citizens of our State will be shocked at Justice Potter's action; they will understand also, from which party the inspiration came; they will correct the evil caused by Justice Potter's action. I leave the case in their hands.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL LAND RESOURCES

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3780) to promote the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources by temporary Federal aid to farmers and by providing for a permanent policy of Federal aid to States for such purposes, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference asked for.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MAPES. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] has made a rather unexpected criticism of one of the justices of the Supreme Court of Michigan who stands very high in that State.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan object to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MAPES. No.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, the only question I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas is, Where are you going to get the \$500,000,000 if the conferees agree?

Mr. JONES. I have answered that question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. JONES, Mr. FULMER, Mr. DOXEY, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. KINZER.

TAXATION OF STOCKS, NOTES, ETC., OWNED BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. GREENWOOD, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 427

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 11047, a bill relating to taxation of shares of preferred stock, capital notes, and debentures of banks while owned by Reconstruction Finance Corporation and reaffirming their immunity. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2½ hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 11418, Rept. No. 2061) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

JUSTICE WILLIAM W. POTTER, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. HOFFMAN, may have 5 minutes in which to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under no circumstances would I impose upon the Members of the House in this manner were it not for the fact that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] has seen fit to make a very uncalled for attack upon one of the justices of the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and, with all due respect, I noticed that much of the applause at the end of his statement came from those gentlemen who have been most free in criticizing members of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Apparently, from what has taken place here in recent months, it is not only proper and according to the rules for Members of this House to take the hide off the fine old gentlemen who sit over here in the United States Supreme Court Building so near to us, but it seems to be a favorite indoor sport of some of the Members of this House.

Not content with criticizing the members of the United States Supreme Court whenever the opinions of that body do not suit the individual whims of a Member, the practice is now to be extended to the judges of the State courts. Hence, because a justice of the Michigan Supreme Court expressed

an opinion which was not acceptable to the Democratic Member from Michigan [Mr. Hook], that justice must be accused of a lack of intelligence and veracity. The accusation will receive absolutely no consideration in Michigan, where all of the members of our supreme court are so well known, that no reply to his charges is necessary, but an explanation of the local situation should be made, in fairness not only to Judge Potter, but to the other judges of that court.

The Michigan delegation should not remain silent while so unjust a criticism is made of a man whose character and actions are above question. Our justices are not appointed; they are elected, and, in fairness to the members of the supreme court of our State, you should all know that each holds his position by virtue of the fact that his name appeared either upon the Democratic or the Republican Party ballot.

Being selected by political conventions, elected by a party vote, they are in no sense barred from political discussions and, necessarily, they take part in political campaigns, and no one, so far as I know, has ever questioned their right so to do nor the propriety of such action.

It is true that Democratic members of that court have had but little to say during the last few years in the way of political discussions. The reason has been that there were no such members upon the court. Unfortunately, perhaps, they were all Republicans; but not so long ago we elected two Democrats, Justices Bushnell and Sharp, and both of those gentlemen, if my memory serves me correctly, have made political campaign speeches, but no one has criticized them for it. That is their own business.

Mr. HOOK. And if I recall correctly, the speeches they made were not political.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the gentleman's memory is not good, nor is his understanding of the speeches that they made correct. They were political speeches, and of the highest order, and with the fact they were made we have no criticism to make. That is a part of our way of transacting business up there. And for the information of the gentleman let me state that in Michigan we elect justices of the supreme court, both Democrats and Republicans, whose characters and whose ability are so far above reproach or criticism that we do not become critical when they express their honest, candid, and sincere opinions. When they speak we listen with attention, with respect; we accept or reject their statements as our judgment decides, for their political pronouncements we do not consider binding. Perhaps the fact that 16 members of the gentleman's party, including the State Democratic chairman, have been sentenced for fraud in stealing an election has something to do with this criticism that we have heard today.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; the gentleman must excuse me. I have no criticism to make of any judge who honestly and sincerely expresses his political opinions; nor is such criticism common in our State. There is no reason why we should not hear our judges. We are not bound by what they say on political questions; their opinions are not judicial decisions.

Further, let me call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] to something received this morning in the mail. Here it is:

Announcing Twin City Townsend meetings. Edward J. Jeffries, judge of Recorder's Court, Detroit, Mich., Friday, February 28, 1936, 7:30 p. m., Peace Temple, Benton Harbor, Mich.

What's this \$200 per month?

I find no fault with that. Let him talk. If his philosophy be true, let it succeed. We can meet those things by argument, not by the gag.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I desire to say, not by way of defense, for under our system the action needs no defense, but that the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] may not go unchallenged. [Applause.]

SURVEY OF MARSHY HOPE CREEK

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 10975) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Marshy Hope Creek, a tributary of the Nanticoke River, at

and within a few miles of Federalsburg, Caroline County, Md., with a view to the controlling of floods.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 10975, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH]?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is the custom to take these bills up on the Consent Calendar. I wonder if the gentleman can explain why this is being taken up out of its regular order?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Yes. The people of Federalsburg had a serious flood last September, and since then they have had floods of smaller proportion, and they are very much afraid of another one at any time. I get daily telephone messages to try to get some legislation. The first thing I have to do is to get this preliminary examination. That is all this bill provides for.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Is this in anticipation of a flood which you expect this spring?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Yes; absolutely.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say to the gentleman that although I am not opposed to his bill, as he undoubtedly should know, this preliminary survey, even if a favorable report is made by the district engineer, will not give them any immediate relief. It is impossible to give the gentleman's constituency any relief this spring with this preliminary examination. It takes at least a year for relief to be given after the examination is made.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. But I have to get along as fast as I can. Of course, if this bill passes the district engineer tells me he will make an examination very shortly and report to the Board of Engineers in Washington.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say to the gentleman I have been given definitely to understand by the Board of Engineers that these surveys are merely to determine the necessity for relief.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. No. It is a flood-control bill. It can come up as an independent measure.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But it is handled in the same way as a river and harbor bill.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. The Flood Control Committee does not usually report omnibus bills.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. I misspoke myself, but nevertheless action must be had by the Board of Engineers. I am given to understand, in connection with a like situation in the State of Michigan, where at the present time the people are very much concerned about their situation, because every year for the last 4 or 5 years their village has been flooded, that there cannot be any relief, even if a favorable report was made, for a year. So although I have no objection to the gentleman's bill, I wonder if we should consent to take it up out of its regular order when there is no possibility of their getting relief this spring.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I do not have the same information that my colleague has.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. When the gentleman spoke to me about this bill I understood him to say that this had the unanimous approval of the Flood Control Committee of the House?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. That is correct.

Mr. SNELL. I have been informed that the Flood Control Committee intended, if they did not do so, to strike out the "survey", which will cost \$5,000. They are willing to have an examination made, but any complete survey will cost \$5,000.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Well, I do not know anything about \$5,000. This is the first time I have heard of it. It was a unanimous report by the committee.

Mr. SNELL. Is the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control present?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I do not see him now. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is acting chairman.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. When did the gentleman introduce this bill?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. About 2 weeks ago.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. And the hearings have just been completed?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. And there is a full committee report on it, or is it just by a subcommittee?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. No; it is the full committee.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. And the gentleman knows nothing about the \$5,000?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I never heard of it before this minute.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. I am informed they have cut the survey out of all bills of this character. If I am correct, I do not think this ought to go through by unanimous consent, although on the information I had from the gentleman from Maryland I said that I had no objection, but I think there is a misunderstanding somewhere. I do not know just exactly where it is.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. RICH. We only had one meeting of the Committee on Flood Control this year, and that was last Friday, and I happened to be attending another committee meeting, so I do not know whether this bill was reported or not, but this bill is coming up in an irregular way, and if the majority leader is going to permit the gentleman from Maryland to bring up this bill out of order, why would he not permit every other Member of Congress to do likewise?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think it is entirely fair for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] to undertake to put the responsibility upon the majority leader for a proposition of this sort when it has been clearly stated that it was in the nature of an emergency proposition and the author of the bill conferred with the minority leader and with the Speaker. As a matter of fact, he did not confer with me about it, although it meets with my approval, and I hope there will be no objection to it.

Mr. SNELL. As far as that is concerned, I am willing to take my responsibility that if it was an emergency proposition I was not going to object, but if it is a fact that the Flood Control Committee have cut the survey out of these bills of similar character I do not think we ought to let that go in in this bill.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. It was a unanimous report by the committee.

Mr. SNELL. Is there not any Member on the floor of the House who is a member of the Flood Control Committee?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say that I have just examined this bill, and where it reads "examination and survey" a committee amendment has stricken out the words "and survey." So I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that after a preliminary examination is made, then, if a favorable report is made, the Board of Engineers must make a survey before any relief can be given.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. The authorization must be granted first; there has to be a beginning.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The only objection we have is to its being taken up out of regular order to the prejudice of all the other flood-control bills on the Consent Calendar. I have no objection to the merits of the gentleman's bill, but we over here charged with the responsibility of examining bills on the Consent Calendar cannot stay on this floor every minute watching bills on this calendar; I cannot do it; and, of course, the others interested cannot either. I do not think it is fair for us to let these bills go through in this

manner to the prejudice of other Members who assume their bills will go through in regular order.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. If the gentleman understood the condition of fear which has existed in Federalburg since the 1st of last September he would not object to this bill. It does not involve any expense.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have said that I have no objection to the merits of the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the bill came before the full committee and was reported out with that section calling for a survey stricken out. It calls only for a preliminary examination, and the fact that there was an emergency justified the committee in reporting it out at this time.

Mr. SNELL. The survey provision was eliminated from the bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is out of the bill entirely.

Mr. SNELL. If it is an emergency proposition I do not think anybody should object.

The regular order was called for.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. If the regular order is demanded, Mr. Speaker, then I object.

SESQUICENTENNIAL, COLUMBIA, S. C.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8886) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the founding of the city of Columbia, S. C., for immediate consideration.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what committee did this come from, the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures?

Mr. FULMER. Yes; and I would like to say to the gentleman from New York that the reason I am making this request now is that the sesquicentennial is to be held during the last part of March, and unless the House passes the bill promptly so it may be passed by the Senate and signed by the President, it will be too late.

Mr. SNELL. Some time ago I tried to get a measure of this kind passed for some people in my section, but the Treasury Department told me it was against their policy.

Mr. FULMER. I may say to the gentleman from New York that there has been some complaining in the Treasury Department about coining these commemorative half dollars, but it is a regular procedure every session. During this session already there have been reported several bills. As I say, the only reason I am asking consideration at this time is because the celebration will be held the last of March, and that is not very far away.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wish to say in fairness to the gentleman from South Carolina that several other bills of a similar character were favorably reported by the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, and I take it they will be called up in due course.

Mr. SNELL. Why not bring them all up at one time and see if we are able to pass them or not?

Mr. FULMER. That would be satisfactory to me, except if this bill is not passed promptly it will be too late.

Mr. SNELL. It is my understanding that the Treasury Department would not favorably recommend any more of these bills. If they have changed their policy, I have no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say, in addition to what the minority leader has said, that last year an application was made by certain members of the Michigan Delegation to have 50-cent pieces struck off in commemoration of the centennial of the admission of the State of Michigan into the Union, and we were turned down flat.

We were informed that it was not the policy of the Treasury Department to issue any more of these commemorative 50-cent pieces, that they would not approve them; and that the President would veto the bill if it was passed. For these reasons, and these reasons only, we did not press the matter.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order. The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Columbia, S. C., there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint 10,000 silver 50-cent pieces, such coins to be of standard size, weight, and fineness of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the model for master dies or other preparations for this coinage.

Sec. 2. Coins commemorating the founding of the city of Columbia, S. C., shall be issued at par, and only upon the request of the committee, person, or persons duly authorized by the mayor of the city of Columbia, S. C.

Sec. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by the committee, person, or persons duly authorized in section 2, and all proceeds shall be used in furtherance of the commemoration of the founding of the city of Columbia, S. C.

Sec. 4. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for the security of the coin; or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein directed.

Sec. 5. The coins authorized herein shall be issued in such numbers, and at such times as they may be requested by the committee, person, or persons duly authorized by said mayor of Columbia, S. C., only upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-five."

Page 2, line 5, strike out the words "the committee, person, or persons" and insert in lieu thereof the words "a committee of not less than three persons."

Page 2, line 9, strike out the words "person, or persons."

Page 2, line 24, strike out the words "person, or persons."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF LAND BETWEEN THE WAIANAE CO. AND NAVY DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request of the Senate:

JANUARY 16 (calendar day, Feb. 22), 1936.

Ordered, That the secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 3521) to authorize an exchange of land between the Waianae Co. and the Navy Department.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the request of the Senate will be granted.

AURORA DAM AND T. V. A.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, last July we had under consideration H. R. 8632, a bill to amend in many material respects the act creating the Tennessee Valley Authority. It will be recalled that only a few months prior thereto a United States district judge in Alabama had declared that the Authority was without the legal or constitutional right to sell power or energy created at Wilson Dam. One of the principal objects of the bill under consideration was to meet the alleged defects set out in the opinion rendered by this district judge, and vest in the Tennessee Valley Authority full power and authority to proceed with its program.

When this measure was under discussion many of us who favored its enactment with certain broadening amendments took the floor and urged its passage, undertaking to point out the advantages which the activities of the Authority brought not only to the trade area of the Tennessee Valley but to all the people of the Nation. There was ample evidence of stubborn opposition to the bill in its original and amended form, and only after prolonged debate was the opposition overcome and the bill passed.

A few days ago the Supreme Court of the United States by an 8-to-1 decision upheld the right of the Tennessee Valley Authority as an arm of the Government to manufacture at Wilson Dam electrical energy and to sell the energy so generated either at the dam or by transmission lines where a market existed. Under the express language of the opinion of Chief Justice Hughes rural electrification is an immediate possibility, and there is no further obstacle to farm owners in the valley having electrical power for their every need. It has long been a dream and will soon be a reality. It will mean that much of the drudgery of farm life will be a thing of the past and that the practical use of a great natural resource will bring to the doors of some of its joint owners luxuries which they had never hoped to enjoy. I cannot adequately express the personal satisfaction which this brings to me. I know thousands of homes where hearts will be made happier and burdens lighter as a result. I expect to assist every community in my district and every home therein to avail itself of the privilege of power at a reasonable rate. They have waited long and patiently for it, and their patience is now to be rewarded.

I happen to represent a district that lies wholly within the trade area known as the Tennessee Valley. In fact, the Tennessee River touches as many counties and affects as much, if not more, territory in my district than it does of any other Member of this Congress. The Tennessee River is the eastern boundary line of my district from the southern border of Kentucky to the northern boundary of Mississippi, across the full width of the State of Tennessee.

I know something of the history of this river and the Tennessee Valley, something of the hardships which the people who love that region and who have spent their lives there trying to earn a living have suffered, and I share with them the dream of hope which the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority 2 years ago brought to them, and the fruition of which is not far distant if we can command a sympathetic ear from each of you who is in a position to assist in the completion and consummation of the ambitious program which lies ahead. Every Member of this Congress who is interested in the conservation, the utilization, and development of the natural water power in this Nation should be interested in the continuance of the Tennessee Valley Authority and in giving it unhampered and unrestricted power and authority to exploit and harness the hitherto sleeping potential power of Tennessee. It is blazing a trail and charting a course for future conservation of the natural water powers of America, and every section of our Nation will some day enjoy the blessings and benefits which will naturally follow from such experimental activities.

There is one phase of the future activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority that I am particularly interested in, namely, the construction of Aurora Dam at a point on or near the Tennessee-Kentucky line. It will be recalled that one of the primary purposes of the Authority is to make the entire Tennessee River navigable and to establish and maintain a 9-foot channel. It has always been classed as a navigable stream, and the Supreme Court in the opinion referred to holds that it is navigable but not adequately improved for commercial navigation. In order to convert it into a stream suitable for commercial navigation 12 months in the year a series of locks and dams are necessary. Some of these have been started and others are being planned. Among these is the one identified by the Authority as Aurora Dam. For some reason the directors of the Authority have never asked for an authorization for its construction, despite the fact that its construction will ultimately be necessary and despite the fact that the chairman of the board of directors of the Authority has promised to construct it.

During the debate on the T. V. A. amendment last July it was suggested by the opposition that no one could determine just what the Authority's plans were and that a definite program should be outlined and made a part of directory legislation. I agree with this criticism to some extent and think that in the next appropriation bill the Authority should be required to start Aurora Dam and provision made for its construction.

This dam is estimated to cost \$40,000,000, and I noticed recently in a newspaper article that the chairman of the Board was suggesting abandoning Aurora Dam and in lieu thereof building a dam across the Tennessee and Ohio Rivers at Paducah, Ky., costing \$200,000,000.

The Authority has no right to build a dam across the Ohio River, in the first place, without amending the basic act, and I know Congress is not going to give it \$200,000,000 for any such purpose, in the second place. The quicker Aurora Dam is authorized and started, just so much quicker will full navigation for the entire river be accomplished, and I sincerely hope that Congress during this session will definitely direct the starting of Aurora Dam and thereby eliminate forever the possibility of a \$200,000,000 expenditure in furtherance of a fantastic and impractical plan.

I intend to work to this end so long as I represent the Seventh District of Tennessee.

A KANSAS FARM WOMAN'S GRATITUDE

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to have printed in the RECORD the following letter from a Kansas farm woman, expressing her gratitude for having been saved from foreclosure and ruin by the humanitarian policies of this administration, and my reply thereto:

VALLEY FALLS, KANS., *Route 4, February 17, 1936.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOUSTON: Words cannot express my gratitude to all of you, regardless of politics, who have stood by President Roosevelt.

There are some who are clamoring loud and long about the unbalanced Budget. These people are warmly clad and well fed and they give little thought to suffering humanity—to the thousands of men, women, and children who are cold and hungry.

Who, may I ask, left the Budget unbalanced? And how long was this precious Budget unbalanced before this administration took office? If I remember right, very little was said about the Budget prior to 1932.

I am not for, nor against, any certain political party; but I am for the man who has had a heart and has been square enough to remember that the little fellow—farmer and town homeowner—loved his home and his wife and children, the same as other groups loved theirs, and wanted a chance to keep them together and to give his children the chance in life that is due every American citizen.

I was reared in northern Kentucky and in a strict Republican home; but this year I'm going to stick to the party which stuck to me; the party which was honest enough to give me a square deal—a chance to keep my home. I am voting for Franklin D. Roosevelt, the squarest man who ever sat in the White House.

Gratefully yours,

Mrs. C. M. NORTHRUP.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 21, 1936.*

Mrs. C. M. NORTHRUP,

Route 4, Valley Falls, Kans.

DEAR MRS. NORTHRUP: This is to acknowledge receipt of your very kind letter of February 17 and to convey my appreciation.

It is a noteworthy fact that as long as President Roosevelt has the loyal and outspoken support of the grateful and liberty-loving people of every party whom he has helped through his tireless and humanitarian efforts there can be no doubt as to the result of the coming election. Mr. Roosevelt has won the hearts of millions of our people and restored hope where fear and discouragement formerly held sway.

May you and all others whom he has so ably defended against oppression continue to prosper and enjoy to the fullest extent the advantages accrued under his noble leadership.

Thanking you for your expression of gratitude, believe me to be, Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. HOUSTON,
Member of Congress.

SHIPPING AND POLITICS

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a quotation which will not be in excess of one-eighth of a page of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, it begins to look like all we are going to do this session is to pass appropriation bills, do a little parliamentary shadow-boxing, and go home. In the last session the ship-subsidy bill was, in my opinion, very properly defeated because of the form in which it was presented.

I have just read an editorial in the Washington Daily News of today, February 24, entitled "Shipping and Politics", which I shall include in my remarks; but I am hoping that if ship-subsidy legislation comes before us, that Congress will not gag itself, as we did on the neutrality legislation, and pass just any kind of bill. The editorial is as follows:

SHIPPING AND POLITICS

It is reported that some of the President's advisers are reluctant to take up ship-subsidy legislation at this session of Congress. Fear of controversy in an election year is given as the reason.

If complete reformation of the American merchant marine is not undertaken promptly there will be little left to reform. With administration backing a good bill could be passed quickly. The President could then carry into his campaign a valuable accomplishment. He would not be open to attack for ignoring conditions that have forced the American merchant fleet in foreign trade to bottom place in respect to modern ships.

Failure to face the issue extends a long series of deplorable abuses which the President himself has condemned.

It is said that a good bill has now been prepared; if that is the case, I hope it receives consideration, and in receiving consideration I hope that it will be of sufficient time, upon open rule and reasonable parliamentary practices, and not under the gag as on the neutrality legislation.

The editorial continues:

A bill approved by competent authorities has been drafted at the Capitol. Its nominal sponsor is Senator GUFFEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania. It apparently will not be introduced, however, until approved by the President.

This new measure is unlike previous subsidy legislation in that it was not conceived as a means of bailing out the shipowners. It is designed to give the United States a merchant fleet necessary to carry a good proportion of American exports and imports, and to serve as an efficient naval auxiliary.

It sets up a five-man board to handle all merchant-marine matters except regulation, which would be placed under the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The board would lay down a long-time construction program. Private operators would be asked to build the necessary ships. If they could finance one-third of the initial investment, the Government would supply the balance under strict controls to prevent excess profits and abuse of the subsidies.

If the operator could not put up the money, and most mail contractors cannot, the Government would do the building itself in private shipyards. If no private operator would charter the new vessels, the Government would operate them on essential trade routes.

That, in substance, is the new bill. It faces honestly conditions as they exist in this feeble industry.

MUNICIPAL PUBLIC WORKS, SKAGWAY, ALASKA

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9130) to authorize the incorporated city of Skagway, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, and for such purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$12,000, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after "\$12,000" insert: "Provided, That the total amount of bonds issued and outstanding at any time under authority of this act and under authority of Public Law No. 174, Seventy-third Congress, approved April 25, 1934 (48 Stat. 611), shall not exceed the sum of \$40,000."

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

ARKANSAS CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a short resolution, authorizing the Clerk of the House to lend to the Arkansas Centennial Commission a lounge in his office upon which Augustus Garland died.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know if that man was a Democrat?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. If he is dead, all right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 428

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to loan to the Arkansas Centennial Commission, for use during the celebration of 1936, a lounge in his office upon which Augustus Garland died. The Clerk shall see that the Government is placed to no expense on account of this loan and return of the property and is authorized to exact such surety and regulations as he deems proper for the return of the lounge in good condition.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURVEY OF MARSHY HOPE CREEK, MD.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 10975) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Marshy Hope Creek, a tributary of the Nanticoke River, at and within a few miles of Federalsburg, Caroline County, Md., with a view to the controlling of floods.

I think there will be no objection to its consideration at this time.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my only purpose in rising at this time is to ask the majority leader and minority leader if the objectors to bills on the Consent Calendar are going to be protected in the future, because last year we would object to certain bills, then the majority leader or the acting majority leader would let them slip through at the tail end of a session by unanimous consent.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made of Marshy Hope Creek, a tributary of the Nanticoke River, at and within a few miles of Federalsburg, Caroline County, Md., with a view to the control of floods, in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for control of floods of the Mississippi River, and of the Sacramento River, Calif., and for other purposes", approved March 1, 1917, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, after the word "examination", strike out "and survey."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill authorizing a preliminary examination of Marshy Hope Creek, a tributary of the Nanticoke River, at and within a few miles of Federalsburg, Caroline County, Md., with a view to the controlling of floods."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow immediately after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he is going to show us, as he claims, how electricity can be generated with coal as cheaply as with water?

Mr. PARKS. The gentleman is going to talk about the prosperity in the gentleman's district.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] I desire to say that I want to speak on the cost of electric power. Among other things, I am going to answer the statement made by the president of the Commonwealth & Southern, to the effect that his company could sell power cheaper than it is now being sold in the Tennessee Valley area if it could buy it at T. V. A. wholesale rates.

Mr. RICH. And the gentleman will try to give us some information showing that we can generate power with coal as cheaply as we can with water.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I can show him where every human being in his district who turns an electric switch is overcharged around three or four hundred percent for his electricity, except perhaps the favored few who buy it in bulk. I have already shown that the people of the State of Pennsylvania are overcharged \$75,000,000 a year for electric lights and power.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Thursday, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know whether the gentleman from Florida is going to tell us where he is going to get the money to build that canal in his State.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have an appropriation bill coming in here which will take practically the entire week and on which there will be ample general debate. Could not the gentleman get this time in general debate on the appropriation bill?

Mr. GREEN. I possibly could, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from New York, but I find it very difficult to get much time, because the time is usually consumed by the members of the committee; and if I did get the time in this way it would not take up any more time of the House.

Mr. SNELL. We will see that the gentleman gets 20 minutes from this side this afternoon.

Mr. GREEN. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman has been assured time from that side of the House if he does not get it here.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio broadcast by our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILSON] on Saturday last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILSON], Saturday, February 22, 1936:

The experimentation in which we have been indulging in the past few years is something new to this country and closely follows the line of thought expressed in governmental activities in some European countries today.

Its object is the centralization of power in one individual and his delegated agents, in direct conflict with American habits, American traditions, and American law.

It contemptuously disregards the fact that ours is basically a Government by the people under an American Constitution formulated upon the belief that these United States form a federation of 48 States and guaranteeing to the individual certain rights which cannot be abrogated by the Government.

Under such a Constitution and its bill of rights, the New Deal and the supreme law of the land cannot exist together. Either we must abandon the idea of embarking our nation upon the high seas of socialistic thought with its fallacies inimical to individual effort, saying to our citizenry that you live and have your being only in a centralized government and that you have no rights which that government is obligated to support and

respect, or we must revere and uphold the Constitution, the supreme law of the land, and refuse to surrender or undermine those guarantees which the Constitution gives to our people which would of necessity carry with it that great American ideal, so different from society's conception of the courts in other countries, that before American courts the citizens and the Government occupy an equal position.

I do not believe that the people of these United States are prepared to abandon a government of law. I do not believe they are ready to cast into oblivion the checks and counterchecks our forefathers so wisely imposed upon the functions of government.

A vast majority of our people not only are in favor of and support the Supreme Court, but are in entire sympathy with and understand the many good and basic reasons for doing so.

It is true that our Constitution did not specifically provide for a judicial review of legislative acts, but everyone must agree that its framers were familiar with such a review and plainly intended the courts to be a check on the legislative and executive branches.

John Adams wrote:

"It is by balancing one of these three powers against the other two that the efforts of human nature toward tyranny can alone be checked and restrained and any degree of freedom preserved."

Washington, in his Farewell Address, said:

"The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and this creates, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power by dividing and distributing it into different depositories and constituting each the guardians of the public weal against invasion by the others has been evinced by experience, ancient and modern. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

The value of such a check on hastily conceived and ill-digested drastic governmental changes as those made in recent years becomes more evident in the face of experience.

When powers exercised by a Federal government lead to the annihilation of a federal system which has withstood the test of time and formed the keystone of a great nation, our people as a whole will be wholeheartedly glad that we have at least one branch of the Government—the judiciary—to supply the brakes.

As James Madison said—

"The jurisdiction claimed for the Federal judiciary is truly the only defensive armor of the Federal Government, or rather the Constitution and the laws of the United States. Strip it of that armor and the door is wide open for nullification, anarchy, and convulsion."

When national experience confirms the value of acting within constitutional lines, we are reminded that there is also a constitutional method provided by that great document to meet the need for adjusting principles, gradually and constitutionally, and in an orderly fashion to fit changing economic conditions of the Nation.

Some, without thought or reason, are prone to look upon courts of last resort as the mouthpieces of political emotions or the servants of prejudice instead of nonpartisan judges of the basic and fundamental law.

In the quiet realm of sober thought we can truly be filled with gratitude in the possession of a consciousness that in all this turmoil and striving, in all the bitterness engendered by the disappointment of a selfish interest or the sting of defeat there still remains, untarnished and impregnable, this lasting bulwark of human liberty. In this branch of the Government lies a continuing power and authority uninfluenced by partisan bias or political or sectional ambitions; notwithstanding the chameleon desire or prejudice of those creating them.

Changing political and economic conditions affecting the whole people are sure to have weight in the formulating of judgment and are often reflected in opinion, but it would be a sorry day for our country when the whims and fancies of mortal likes and dislikes and partisan selfishness and desires are to become the motivating thoughts behind official acts.

Our courts must be maintained upon a high plane of integrity and must unquestionably remain far removed from partisan bias and, like Caesar's wife, be above suspicion.

The administration's idea of a single simple republic in which the states are mere counties and are subject to one common law is in direct opposition to the thought of the founders of our Republic.

Critics are seeking to deprive the Court of the right to nullify legislation enacted by Congress. Some are of the opinion that this could be accomplished through the adoption of a broad amendment to the Constitution under which Congress would be specifically authorized to enact legislation dealing with questions of social and economic welfare without regard to State lines and State sovereignty.

Such an amendment would be revolutionary and most certainly result in wiping out the independence of each individual State and constituting the United States "a central Government exercising uncontrolled police powers in every State of the Union, superseding all local control or regulation of the affairs or concerns of the States."

Many think that questions arising under the Constitution are abstruse and of little interest to the average individual. Nothing can be further from the truth. The man in the street is vitally

interested in having a job, and it is a well-known fact that jobs depend upon industrial and commercial activity. It is self-evident that we cannot have that sort of activity unless we are governed according to law which is the outgrowth of a clear, careful, conscientious deliberation instead of having foisted upon us rules, regulations, and codes which emanate from hasty action based upon hysteria and emotions.

All fair-minded thinkers, I submit, will agree that national confidence and industrial recovery markedly improved after the famous *N. R. A.* decision in May last.

In that decision a courageous Court definitely and positively checked a dangerous attempt to pyramid Executive powers, but likewise checkmated what was intended to be a permanent change in a national policy by declaring that if and when our form of government is to be altered, it must be done after due and careful deliberation, according to the rules laid down by the people themselves and only after a proper submission of the questions to a vote of the people and not in a moment of pique, passion, or lust for power.

The Constitution can be changed basically and fast enough by the people after conscientious reflection. To do it otherwise is to abandon reason and become the tool of prejudice and ruthless ambition.

Norman Thomas, former Socialist candidate for President, contended that the Supreme Court presented a stumbling block to prosperity.

No contention could be more in keeping with the apparent un-American trend of thought in the present national administration. It is in entire keeping with the policies of the bureaucratic Government now dominating the lives of our people.

The real problem is shall law alone or arbitrary will rule.

Only law can give that essential protection to individual rights, be they personal or property, no matter what may be the character of the Government or the kind of social or economic questions involved.

History is replete with its examples of the eternal struggle between human rights and arbitrary power, and the world is not without its examples today of the destruction of the rights of the common people where a legislative body is subservient to a dominant political party or the orders of a dictator.

There can be but one offset to despotism, and that is constitutionalism.

To discard the Constitution and adopt despotism with the prayer that that despotism may be benevolent is placing too much faith in human frailties.

People are sometimes disturbed when plans for social betterment are destroyed by the application of sound legal principles, and they fail to consider the abyss into which they may be cast by a failure to apply those principles.

No government can exist without law and no result is worthy of achievement, no matter what benevolent motive may actuate it, if it is accomplished without law.

Such despotism may be the subtle outgrowth of a concentration of power in an administrative hand prone to use its vast influence in forcing legislative action inimical to individual rights. To avert this possible situation, none are better fitted to determine the bounds within which one may go than those technically qualified and lawfully ordained to interpret the law.

The great danger to be avoided is the undermining of the law even, as has been said, under the guise of "healthy public sentiment." Such a theory is an insidious poison which, if not checked, will in time destroy our whole organic system, and our best method of overcoming it is the same today as it has always been, "a fearless and impartial interpretation of law by a free and independent judiciary."

We must eliminate the friction which has been breeding bitterness.

The policy of imposing upon the Government the functions of a nurse to humanity is a mistaken one. When that policy is based upon the nefarious machinations of party politics and personal ambition it becomes abominable.

Grover Cleveland said:

"Federal aid . . . encourages the expectation of paternal care on the part of the Government and weakens the sturdiness of our national character."

Woodrow Wilson said:

"Interpreting the Constitution is a judicial function and deserves the best judicial talent available. Wise interpretation can best be made by those removed from the pressure of politics and the motive of possible personal aggrandizement of power."

And as has been well said—

"Our Government is necessarily a government of laws and not men."

This assurance can only be well founded when it is entrusted to a judiciary not under the control of the electorate nor subject to the whims and passions of the mob.

There is nothing in the Constitution that I have been able to find which gives the Congress the right to interpret its own acts.

If we had no arbiter, no referee, to pass upon the constitutionality of an act of Congress, we would be met with the anomaly of a Congress presuming to act under a constitution and yet with full power to do ought that it saw fit in direct violation of its very provisions.

In this respect the Supreme Court is the last resort of its humblest citizens.

Under the safe and sound principles enunciated in the Constitution we have weathered more than one economic storm, and under those same provisions we will withstand the present one. In

constitutional matters the Court only restrains attempted invasions of rights guaranteed to the citizens by the Constitution. It legislates nothing.

Under all circumstances it would seem clear that the Congress ought not to be the judge of its own powers over the States. If that were the case then each State would be at the mercy of an ever-changing political majority in the legislative branch. Neither can it be assumed that the States should be the judges, for in that event it would spell the dissolution of the Union. When these questions do arise there must be some power to settle them, and under our form of Government that power rightfully belongs to the judiciary, not whether the act of Congress is in itself wise, but whether the power itself is properly placed.

No sane person would argue that the framers of the Constitution, with a vision that was prophetic, could to the minutest detail, define and allocate every power of Government. This of necessity gives rise to honest differences of opinion. This difference of opinion exists as well in the legislative as in the judicial branch of the Government. Whenever differences of opinion arise which are insurmountable, the only safe method is that which has always existed under our system of Government—that the will of the majority shall prevail.

PROPERTY CLERK OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 399) to amend sections 416 and 417 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 416 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia be amended by striking out the word "fifty" where it occurs in said section, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "one hundred."

SEC. 2. That section 417 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia be amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 417. All property, except perishable property and animals, that shall remain in the custody of the property clerk for the period of 6 months, with the exception of motor vehicles which shall be held for a period of 3 months, without any lawful claimant thereto after having been three times advertised in some daily newspaper of general circulation published in the District of Columbia, shall be sold at public auction, and the proceeds of such sale shall be paid into the policemen's fund; and all money that shall remain in his hands for said period of 6 months shall be so advertised, and if no lawful claimant appear shall be likewise paid into the policemen's fund."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "sale" insert "having been retained by the said property clerk for a period of 3 months without a lawful claimant;"

In line 8, after the word "shall" insert the word "then."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF REAL ESTATE FOR TAXES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 3035) to provide for enforcing the lien of the District of Columbia upon real estate bid off in its name when offered for sale for arrears of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'CONNOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I make this reservation only to ask the gentlewoman from New Jersey a few questions on the tax bill. Is this the tax bill that provides for the collection of back taxes upon personal property that has not been paid over a period of years?

Mrs. NORTON. No; this bill simply provides that the District Commissioners shall have the right to sell property that they have bought at delinquent tax sales after serving notice on the last owner of record, and also publishing such notice in the newspapers of the District for 3 successive weeks. There is nothing else involved in the measure.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. May I ask whether the gentlewoman's committee is considering some legislation to provide a method for collecting some of the back taxes that have not

been collected for a period of years, such as the Wardman Park Hotel, the Carlton Hotel, and others that have been dodging their taxes and refusing to pay. I understand there is not adequate legislation to compel them to pay.

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman that just at this time we are not considering such legislation.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Does the committee contemplate considering such a bill?

Mrs. NORTON. We may.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Soon?

Mrs. NORTON. Possibly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever any real estate in the District of Columbia has been, or shall hereafter be, offered for sale for nonpayment of taxes or assessments of any kind whatsoever, and shall have been bid off in the name of the District of Columbia, and more than 2 years shall have elapsed since such property was bid off as aforesaid and the same has not been redeemed as provided by law, the Commissioners of said District may, in the name of the District aforesaid, petition the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, sitting in equity, to enforce the lien of said District for taxes or other assessments on the aforesaid property by decreeing a sale thereof; and up to the time of the sale hereinafter provided for such property may be redeemed by the owner or other person having an interest therein by the payment of all taxes or assessments due the District of Columbia upon said property and all legal penalties and costs thereon, together with such other expenses as may have been incurred by said District prior to, and as a result of, the filing of the action herein provided for.

Sec. 2. That before any such action shall be instituted the aforesaid Commissioners shall cause notice to be given in the name appearing upon the records of the assessor as the owner of such property, by registered mail directed to the last known address of such person, and by publication once a week for 3 successive weeks in some daily newspaper published and circulated generally in the District of Columbia, against said person and all other persons having or claiming to have any right, title, or interest in or to the real estate proposed to be proceeded against, their heirs, devisees, executors, administrators, and assigns, by such designation, to appear before them on a day certain, which day shall be at least 10 days after the last publication of said notice, and show cause, if any they have, why the said real estate should not be proceeded against. For the purpose of the proceedings herein provided for, the person appearing by the assessor's records, at the time of the first publication of notice, as the owner of such property, and any other persons who may appear in response to the publication aforesaid and claim to have an interest in such property, shall be deemed proper parties defendant in any such proceedings. Upon the filing of the petition aforesaid, the court shall pass an order directed to the person or persons named as defendants therein and to all other persons having or claiming to have any right, title, or interest in the real estate proposed to be sold, their heirs, devisees, executors, administrators, and assigns, by such designation, directing them to appear on a day certain, which day shall be not less than 30 days after the date of the last publication of said order, and show cause, if any they have, why said real estate should not be proceeded against and sold. The said order shall be published once a week for 3 successive weeks in some daily newspaper published and circulated generally in the District of Columbia, and such publication shall be considered as sufficient service upon such person or persons as cannot be found by the marshal within the District of Columbia or who are non-resident or unknown, their heirs, devisees, executors, administrators, and assigns; and the proceedings or sale of such real estate shall not be rendered invalid if the true owner or owners or any other person or persons having any right, title, or interest in said real estate shall not be included as a party to the suit, if it shall appear that the publication herein provided for shall have been duly made.

Sec. 3. Upon proof in said suit of the failure of the owner of any such property to redeem the same as provided by law, the court shall, without unreasonable delay, decree a sale of the property to satisfy the lien of the District of Columbia for taxes, assessments, penalties, interest, and costs, and any other costs or expenses that have been incurred by said District prior to or after the institution of suit and in connection therewith, which said costs shall include court costs, but in no such case shall there be any allowance by court of a docket fee, attorney's fee, or trustee's commission. All such sales shall be conducted by the collector of taxes or his deputy, by public auction, either in the office of said collector or in front of the premises to be sold, as the court may determine, after advertisement for 10 consecutive days in some daily newspaper published and circulated generally in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That if it shall appear that there were any substantial defects in any tax sale, no part of the penalties and charges incidental to such sales shall be collectible; but nothing herein contained shall in any wise affect any costs incurred by the District of Columbia in the institution and prosecution of the suit.

Sec. 4. Every such sale shall be reported to and confirmed by said equity court, and no sale shall be made for an amount less than such aggregate taxes, interest, and costs incurred in the institution of suit, including advertising and sale, unless by express order of the court. Any surplus remaining from sales made under

this act shall be paid by the collector of taxes into the registry of the court, to abide its further order for payment to the person or persons entitled thereto; and any such moneys remaining unclaimed for a period of 5 years after confirmation of any such sale shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States and credited to the revenues of the District of Columbia. Upon confirmation of such sale by order of court and payment of the purchase price, and upon full compliance with all of the terms of sale, the clerk of the court shall execute and deliver to the purchaser a deed to the property so sold, which deed shall convey to said purchaser all of the right, title, and estate of all persons whether named in such suit or not.

Sec. 5. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 11, strike out the word "pass" and insert "enter."

On page 4, line 2, strike out "devices" and insert "devisees."

On page 4, line 18, after the word "by", insert the word "the."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, that finishes the business of the District of Columbia for the day.

TO EXEMPT CERTAIN SMALL FIREARMS FROM THE PROVISIONS OF THE NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3254) to exempt certain small firearms from the provisions of the National Firearms Act.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 1 of the National Firearms Act relating to the definition of "firearms" is amended by inserting after "definition" a comma and the following: "but does not include any rifle which is within the foregoing provisions solely by reason of the length of its barrel if the caliber of such rifle is .22 or smaller and if its barrel is 16 inches or more in length."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 11418, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, and pending that, I should like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if we can agree on time for general debate?

Mr. THURSTON. I have requests for 2½ hours.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have no requests on this side, and as far as I am concerned, we can begin reading the bill now.

Mr. THURSTON. I do not know whether to congratulate or commiserate the gentleman. I supposed there would be requests on that side, and we might continue for 2 days or more. If we can go along for the remainder of the day we can take care of it tomorrow.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We can conclude debate today, or if it goes over tomorrow, debate will be confined to the bill.

Mr. THURSTON. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate today be divided, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THURSTON] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. CANNON of Missouri was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. McREYNOLDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for giving me 5 minutes, in which I should like, not to bring my remarks to bear upon the legislation now before the House for discussion, but simply that I may call the attention of the House to a joint resolution which I have introduced this afternoon, calling upon the Secretary of the Interior to erect an appropriate memorial to the memory of Dr. Samuel Alexander Mudd, who was a physician in Charles County, Md., at the time of the assassination of President Lincoln.

Dr. Mudd was charged with and convicted by a United States military commission for having given aid to John Wilkes Booth on the night following the assassination of the President of the United States. He was sent to what was known in those days as the "Devils Island" of America, off the coast of Florida, on the Dry Tortugas, and at Fort Jefferson incarcerated for a period of 4 years. He knew that he was there unjustly and that he was not guilty of having assisted John Wilkes Booth after the assassination of President Lincoln.

Yet this good doctor, having within himself an embodiment of what we think of always as unselfish service to his fellow men, on that shark-surrounded island off the Florida coast, gave of his medical talent and the real heart of his profession to curing a scourge of yellow fever which swept through officers and prisoners at that time. Because of his heroic and unselfish service, the case was called to the attention of President Johnson that he had been unjustly sentenced by the military commission for a crime which he did not commit. Men had been thinking, unfortunately, in terms of shock from Lincoln's death and the heat and passion following the War between the States remained. One of the last official acts of President Johnson, upon careful review of the case, was to grant an unconditional pardon to Dr. Mudd, this country doctor from Charles County, Md. Dr. Mudd then returned to his home and practiced in that section for many years afterward. One night while on an errand of mercy in the discharge of his profession he contracted pneumonia and died.

The reason I have introduced this resolution is because I have learned these facts in my study of certain authentic articles and historical data and because it was also called to my attention by my friend, the well-known historian, Matthew Page Andrews, of Harpers Ferry, W. Va., and Baltimore; and I realize that while the pardon of this man, of course, struck from the records the guilt previously attached, in that fine act there was that done that was passive, and, now that we remember that Dr. Mudd had nothing to do with the assassination of President Lincoln, it is fitting, after these long years have passed, for the Congress of the United States, through this resolution, to see to it that something positive is done in behalf of this man who embodied all the splendid attributes of the medical profession.

If it had not been for Dr. Mudd, it is doubtful that more than four or five men would have lived to tell the tale of what happened on that vermin-ridden, shark-surrounded key of the Dry Tortugas off the Florida coast. He played no favorites. Even though a prisoner who knew he was not guilty, he never forgot that he was, first, last, and always, a physician administering to mankind. It is impossible to think that any God-fearing, ethical country doctor of the type to which I have been accustomed—if he did not know who John Wilkes Booth was and what he had done—would act any differently today.

I have introduced this short but significant resolution calling for an appropriate memorial to be placed upon the ruins of old Fort Jefferson, that there a tablet will remain setting out the services which this man rendered while unjustly incarcerated in behalf of his suffering fellow men. I trust the Congress of the United States will see to it that the resolu-

tion becomes a law, because we realize today that we look at history not through the eyes of prejudice but through the eyes of truth. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to support the resolution offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] providing for the vindication of Dr. Samuel A. Mudd at this late date and the erection of a memorial commemorating the distinguished service rendered by him while a prisoner of war. I have often heard the story of his heroism and his sacrifices from the lips of his kinsman, Dr. Joseph A. Mudd, who was a noted historian and editor and the author of two histories of my own county. Members of the Mudd family emigrated from Maryland, where they had resided since its colonization by Lord Baltimore, and settled in Lincoln County, Mo., where their descendants reside today firm in the faith of their fathers and loyal to the highest ideals of their American citizenship. Dr. Joseph A. Mudd, long a resident of my county, spent the later years of his life in Washington, where he was an intimate friend of Speaker Champ Clark and where he occupied high positions both in the service of the Government and the orders of his church. His accounts of the events leading up to Dr. Samuel Mudd's arrest and incarceration corroborate the statements made by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and more than justify the eloquent tribute paid by Mr. RANDOLPH to the life, character, and loyalty of this faithful physician.

I shall support the gentleman's resolution providing for an appropriate memorial to be erected at old Fort Jefferson recalling the great injustice suffered by Dr. Mudd, the nobility of character with which he bore it, and especially his services to suffering humanity and the maintenance of the ethical standards of his profession under such tragic conditions. [Applause.]

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, disregarding for the moment all political considerations, let us consider the state of the Union in connection with the legislation now before us. Nothing can here be said by me which will in any way enlighten any Member of the House upon the present situation. Nevertheless, in view of a letter received last week, it may be well to again call to mind the situation now confronting us and to suggest what may be termed "constructive measures" which will tend to bring about a betterment in our condition.

It has been the custom for Members addressing the House to call attention to their disinterestedness, their desire to serve the country as a whole, and their sincerity of purpose. To me such statements seem superfluous, and we may assume that the Members of this body, despite the frequent comments to the contrary, possess as much of honesty, ability, and willingness to serve as does the average citizen, no matter in what labor, business, or profession he may be engaged.

Let us refer to the President's statement of a principle as old as the Nation, as old as the family. This is what he said:

Now, the credit of the family depends chiefly on whether that family is living within its income. And this is so of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

Revenues must cover expenditures. Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuation of that habit means the poor-house.

But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay, and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy.

In his message to this Congress on March 10, 1933, he said:

For 3 long years the Federal Government has been on the road toward bankruptcy.

Today we are confronted with a situation, not with a theory. As the President so well and so truthfully said:

Remember well that attitude and method—the way we do things, not just the way we say things, is nearly always the measure of our sincerity.

After 3 long years of unheard-of appropriations, and a few Republicans, as well as many Democrats, voted for these appropriations, the country finds itself, so far as unemployment is involved, practically in no better position than when the spending began.

True, there are signs—yes, evidence—of a return of prosperity, but the degree of prosperity can in no way be compared with our recovery from other panics, other depressions.

Again let me quote the President:

This depression is today's problem. We cannot, and must not, borrow against the future to meet it.

So here we are. If criticism be made of this situation or of the methods which brought it about, the answer always is, What have you to offer? This is a fair question, and frequently it has been answered, although the answer seems to be disregarded.

For myself I can only agree with the President that continued borrowing has but one end; that continued spending of amounts far beyond the income of the Nation, as admittedly has been the course during the past 3 years, can end only in national bankruptcy.

The answer to this course is obvious. It is plain to everyone. One of two things must happen. Either the income must be increased or the expenditures must be reduced.

It is evident that the income, other than by way of taxation, cannot, under the present method, equal or exceed the expenditures.

Then we have two courses, and this, in all humility, may it be said, is a constructive suggestion—either increase the taxes or reduce the expenditures until a balance is reached, or employ a combination of both; increase the rate of taxation and reduce the expenditures until we are living within our income and the Budget is balanced.

We either must increase our taxes, which none of us, seeking reelection—and the gentleman agrees with me, I am sure—wishes to do at this particular time; or we must reduce our appropriations, and that, too, would cost us votes. We are in for one or the other, or we may have a combination of the two. We may increase taxes a little but not enough to balance the Budget, or we may reduce our appropriations but not enough to accomplish that. Perhaps we should take a little of each.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. ANDRESEN. What does the gentleman think about placing a high excise tax upon the main necessities of life?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I do not know anything about the different kinds of taxes. I only know that, under whatever name or in whatever form they come, they always fall upon the fellow who produces. As the coauthor of the Frazier-Lemke bill so often tells us, all the wealth is in the earth, and somewhere someone must labor to get it out, either in the form of ore, forest products, or in the form of crops. If the President is correct—and I think he is—he told us how that comes about. He said:

Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors. If they are excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms, and hence in hordes of hungry tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain. Our people and our business cannot carry this excessive burden of taxation.

So my thought was, regardless of the political aspect of the thing, that sooner or later, and probably sooner, unless we are to have repudiation, unless we are to have bankruptcy, we must lessen our expenditures. The only thought we should have is as to how we are to reduce our expenditures and where. Nobody wants to reduce expenses when those expenses affect his district or his particular group. But we will have to commence somewhere, regardless of our personal desires.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman in favor of cutting out relief expenditures?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That all depends on what you call relief expenditures. As I understand this \$4,880,000,000 was for relief. I suppose the gentleman's question is, Would I favor cutting that out? Am I wrong?

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understood, there were \$880,000,000 in connection with the C. C. C. Of course, a substantial portion of the balance was directly or indirectly allocated for public works and Federal grants. The direct relief, or what we call the E. R. A. or the W. P. A., would, of course, be a considerable proportion, but much less than \$4,000,000,000. But brushing aside many of the projects with which I am not in agreement on the basic question of relief, having in mind the fact that millions are out of work, what is the gentleman's reaction? I am not asking a question just to ask a question, but I should like to get the gentleman's reaction.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In common with every other Member of the House, I assume, no one believes we should let anyone starve or that we should let anyone freeze; but this thought comes to me, that somewhere, sometime along the line we must quit extending relief, because if we do not, finally we will take from the group that is producing, those who have a little capital to enable men to start business, we will take from that group to support this ever-increasing number. In the end we will all be on relief. It reminds me of a cartoon I saw in the Chicago Tribune 2 or 3 years ago of a wagon being drawn with all the officeholders sitting in it and one or two little taxpayers out in front pulling the wagon, and finally they got an idea and they went back and crawled up on the wagon. Now, that is where we will all go in the end if relief and made work continue.

But, you say, all these people are on relief. They cannot be permitted to starve. True, but some must take less and some must contribute more. I am opposed to the kind of relief we are getting and the method of administration.

Beyond question you cannot continually take from those who are employed and from those who have property and give to an ever-increasing rate to an ever-increasing number who are unemployed and who are in want. If you do, then, in the end, all are reduced to poverty, for there must be some who can furnish the capital, the resources, to build the factories, to furnish the machinery, to restock the farms, to purchase the necessary tools to carry on industries and agriculture and business as well. The individual, no matter how willing, cannot engage in any one of these occupations or businesses if he depends only upon his own individual physical or mental efforts. He must have capital.

There is no question but that expenditures can be reduced, and my purpose this morning is to point out some of the foolish ways in which we have been spending money and, as they are foolish, discontinue them.

If poverty is as widespread, if hunger is as common, if need of clothing and of shelter is as universal as we have been told many, many times in the past months, in the last few years, then certainly we can do without those things which are not essential to the relief of hunger, of cold, of suffering.

Tell me, if you will, why it is that this Government should spend—and I cite but one or two of the instances, for they are illustrative of the whole—\$3,993 at Richford, Wis., to improve a trout stream and increase insect life while at the same time it is spending \$18,590 at East Bridgewater, Mass., to drain swamps and ponds to eliminate insect life?

Why after the killing of 6,000,000 pigs should the Government spend \$9,478 to drain a piggery on Winter Street in Waltham, Mass.?

With all of the unemployed on our roll, why should it spend \$40,000 to train 500 girls to act as servants?

If people are hungry, if they are going unclothed, why spend \$4,265 to improve race tracks at Dayton, Ohio, when the sponsors of that project put up just \$45?

Why spend \$500,000—a half million dollars—to make the bridle paths in the borough of Queens, N. Y., more attractive?

Why spend \$81,611 to connect the little village of Skull Valley, with 80 people, with the town of Yava, 75 people, in the State of Arizona?

Why spend at Meridian, Pa., \$12,589 on tennis courts, handball, and baseball grounds?

Why spend at Duluth for tennis courts and a ball field \$117,429 when the sponsors only kicked in \$4,494.

Why spend in the city of Chicago \$723,853 for amusement and to put vaudeville troupes on the road?

Why appropriate \$3,000,000 for a national theater project plan?

Why give to Monroe County, in the State of New York, \$10,440 to make a survey of the deaf children of pre-school age when there are only 14 such children in the county?

Let us go over a moment to the State of Wisconsin, where, the New York Sun says, in the town of Ojibwa, with a population of 293, the President has approved a project calling for the creation of navigation pools at an expense of \$16,760, an expenditure amounting to more than \$57 for each man, woman, and child in the village.

The purpose of a navigation pool, as announced by the W. P. A., is to provide facilities for canoeing, rowing, and fishing. The Sun continues:

In this way the inhabitants may receive enough to buy the necessary canoes, rowboats, and fishing tackle in addition to enjoying, presumably, the free use of the pool. The New Deal is spending nearly \$75,000 more on similar navigation pools in three other Wisconsin towns that are so small that even the Rand-McNally atlas fails to list them.

Oh, the list might be indefinitely extended, but take a look, if you will, at the other side of the picture. Here is a quotation from a letter received last week from the Humane Society of Kalamazoo, a nonpolitical society in the Third District of Michigan, its president, the officers and members of that society having but one thought in mind—to relieve suffering, to aid the unfortunate.

The president of that organization writes that the city of Kalamazoo—a city of 54,786—had available for the original purpose of caring for the unemployable cases some \$32,000 per month, and then states:

But today this \$32,000 is spread over so many relief cases that, were ordinary family relief budgets adhered to, it would amount to a relief expenditure of from \$50,000 to \$60,000 a month. * * *

So thin has relief been spread that, over the case load as a whole, less than 5 cents per meal per person is available in food budgets. Local conditions have been made worse by the extreme weather that has descended upon this region for several weeks. Private-agency funds are taxed to the limit to meet needs which are not being met by the E. R. A. The largest of these private agencies, the Family Welfare Associates (Civic League) is already in the red \$2,000 for this month, with the month only half gone. * * *

We are asking you to use your influence to the utmost to bring about some reallocation of Federal funds sufficient so that local E. R. A. administrations may again be able to take care adequately of the employable cases which it seems they now must carry on their rolls, so that this may not be done at the expense of the unemployables, as is now the case; and, second, that W. P. A. checks be paid promptly.

I know the gentleman [Mr. McCORMACK] does not agree with all these propositions. Then why, after killing off 6,000,000 pigs, should the Government spend \$9,478 to drain a piggery on Winter Street in Waltham, Mass.? With all the unemployed on the rolls, why should the Government spend \$40,000 to train 500 girls to act as servants? Over on the Passamaquoddy project they are putting in an electric dishwasher. After they get those girls trained, at \$40,000, why not send them up there and let the electric dishwasher have a vacation? If people are hungry, if they are to go unclothed, why spend \$4,265 to improve race tracks? Race tracks! These people over in Kalamazoo, Mich., are living on 5 cents a meal and here we are spending about \$5,000 to improve race tracks at Dayton, Ohio.

What was the gentleman's question?

Mr. THOM. What became of the 6,000,000 pigs that were slaughtered?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know.

Mr. THOM. I did not think the gentleman did.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I can tell the gentleman where some of them went.

Mr. THOM. Does the gentleman know officially?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman means by "officially" what is shown by the record of the Department, no; and I doubt if anybody else knows. I do know what the papers in Chicago said as to their being dumped along the Illinois Central Railroad tracks.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Being from Missouri, and the gentleman having to be shown, I can inform the gentleman that I saw with my own eyes a thousand of them dumped in the Mississippi River.

Mr. THOM. That is untrue according to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SHORT. That is not untrue.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to clear this up?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I think I will not yield further.

Mr. THOM. No; I do not think the gentleman wants to have it cleared up.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I hate to see a Democrat and a Republican indulge in acrimonious discussion.

Mr. THOM. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] made a statement which he cannot back up.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not talking politics now.

Mr. THOM. No; that is all the gentleman talks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, let the gentleman think this over and tell me the answer tomorrow—not today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, not for a controversial question at all?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me state the program as I understand it, and make the observation in passing that none of us know which is the better, a straight dole or relief work. The idea of work relief is that the millions benefited may retain their self-respect. Whether this will be best in the long run time alone will tell. The gentleman from Michigan is fair. Brushing aside particular projects, because I have my own opinion, too, of the value of some of them, would there not be grave danger with a body of people numbering 1,000,000, 3,000,000, or 3,500,000 on the dole of a break-down of their individual morale, and that this would have a serious effect on government in the future? So the basic question of relief was linked up with work, as I understand it, first, in order that the individual could retain his self-respect, and, second, that in the future after the depression is over this group would not have a disintegrating effect upon government itself. Specific projects, or some of them, I criticize; but I think work is a necessary part of relief for the reasons I have set forth; I would like to hear the gentleman's reaction, whether or not he believes a straight dole less expensive over a long period of time, having in mind the next generation, or whether he believes relief should be coupled with some kind of work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a fair question, but it is one that cannot be answered correctly, decisively, satisfactorily, probably because it is purely a matter of opinion. Whether the dole or so-called made work has the greater tendency to break down the morale of the person on relief I cannot say. I believe their morale is being impaired.

On the whole, if relief must be extended to those who are able-bodied, capable of working, then by all means they should work according to their ability to work, but, in my judgment, the work should be not purely made work, in the sense of giving them something to do, for those working at such projects realize full well they are receiving only a dole, but they should be given work on worth-while permanent projects that are self-liquidating and that are necessary.

What can we do about it? There is a limit, as before stated, to the help which can be given. In view of this dire need, is it not time that we take more thought as to the amounts which we are now appropriating?

Permit me to call your attention to the bill now before us. Can we not cut the appropriations in this bill, so that relief may be extended to those in such desperate situations as that just indicated?

Look at this Passamaquoddy proposition. Here is a great project of extremely doubtful value. It is my understanding that, in the beginning, there was an adverse report as to whether it was a self-liquidating proposition. But, if it is to

be built, why should it not be constructed in the ordinary way?

But what is the Government attempting to do at the present time? Among other items is a dormitory of 87 rooms for the accommodation of 145 persons who are to work on the project, with mess arrangements for approximately twice that number.

The furnishings of this dormitory are to cost \$33,000—this for 145 persons. It matters not that these dormitories are to be rented and that a profit may be returned to the Government. In the end, the dormitory will be dismantled, will serve no useful purpose.

Why should not the workers be housed as such workers usually are? While people are hungry, while people are cold, while children are going to school in Kalamazoo and vicinity without sufficient covering for their feet and their bodies, the Government is asking for 217 ash receivers for the use of 145 persons who are to work on the Passamaquoddy and these receivers, be it known, are to be furnished with or without design, in white, black, green, blue, and yellow. Two hundred and seventeen ash receivers for 145 workers!

Then there is silverware. The ordinary knives, forks, and spoons will not do. It must be silverware. There must be bath mats. There must be 248 dozen bath and other towels. There must be 10 dozen linen scarfs. There are upholstered chairs. There are love seats. There are pictures, 120 of them for 90 rooms. There are candlesticks of northern maple, of colonial style. There are pewter plates, oval shape, to be used with these candlesticks—I quote, "for ornamental purposes."

There are electric dishwashers. What becomes of those 500 young ladies who were trained for domestic service? If the object of the appropriations is relief and employment, why use an electric dishwasher?

There are two radios, presumably to bring in the speeches of statesmen. Clocks, grandfather type, two of them, walnut, mahogany, or maple, colonial style, 8-day spring driven, with pendulum movement, Westminster chimes, so that the tired and weary souls may be musically told the hour, and the clocks, be it known, must be of a standard make, manufactured in the year in which they are to be purchased.

Let me get a little nearer to Kalamazoo, to that city which sends out the information that it is attempting to feed some of its people on 5 cents a meal—to my home town of Allegan, where, on the 25th day of February 1935, there appeared in the Allegan Gazette and the Allegan News an announcement by the local E. R. A. supervisor that classes for the teaching of basketball, dramatics, chorus, sewing, dancing, bridge playing, and orchestral training would be made available to the women of Allegan who were more than 16 years of age.

Money for the teaching of dancing, bridge playing, when down at Kalamazoo, 23 miles away, the unfortunate ones are limited to 5 cents per meal. Where is the sense to all this?

Note this editorial from the Allegan News of February 21, 1936—Allegan is a town of less than 4,000:

Is it any wonder that the people are getting heartily sick of the present administration and its program of spending billions of dollars in order to place men and women at a job, any job, especially, when we review the kind of projects through which millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money is being wasted?

In this city we have W. P. A. workers in charge of ice skating, and we even have come to the point where we have W. P. A. employees holding ping-pong schools and conducting checker tournaments or games.

In this little village of mine of less than 4,000 people, is there a boy or a girl in that town old enough to strap on a pair of skates who does not know how to skate, who cannot go on the river, the lakes, the ponds, in the winter, skate, and in the summer swim like a fish?

Mr. Chairman, I am not mentioning these items for political purposes. I am mentioning them to see if we cannot get together as ordinary fellows and cut out what we might term this "monkey business." Think of teaching our boys and girls to skate and how to play hockey, while down in

Kalamazoo they only have 5 cents a meal to furnish food for some of their people.

The question may be asked, What are you going to do about it? The President has made the statement that taxes come from the sweat of man's brow and labor. What should we do? I know this statement is not popular, but why should we not now be honest with ourselves? Why should we not be honest with our folks at home? Why should we not take the position that for every bill appropriating \$1 or \$100 we also bring in a provision levying the tax to pay that bill? [Applause.] Why not let the tax bill follow the appropriation bill? I have faith enough in my people at home to believe they are willing to accept this situation. They are willing to pass judgment on these things.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it the gentleman's thought that we should levy taxes sufficient to pay the current operating expenses of the Government?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why certainly.

Mr. KNUTSON. It would bankrupt industry in this country if we were to levy taxes sufficient to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What difference does it make if we bankrupt the Government now or at some other time by piling up an unpayable debt?

Mr. KNUTSON. It would cause chaos.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There appears to be just the one course for us to follow. Let me repeat it for it is constructive. Be-set as we are on all sides with continual demands for more cash, for more appropriations, realizing as we must that these debts must some time be paid, unless the Nation is to become a bankrupt, we should have the courage to do the thing which the President once advocated, the only thing which will stop this course which leads only to disaster. As we make appropriations, impose taxes to meet those appropriations and soon the roar from the forgotten man—the taxpayer—will convince us that spending for any except absolutely necessary purposes must end. That is the way a man who is thrifty and wise runs his business, maintains his family; it is the way, and the only way, by and through which we can come out of this depression.

If those who are demanding appropriations understand that they are to be paid "in the sweat of every man who labors", many, yes, most, of the demands will cease and many of our troubles—practically all of them—will be over.

[Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, we now have up for consideration the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. KELLER. Where are we going to get the money?

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman wants me to answer the question, which is somewhat irregular at this time, may I say that I do not think there is a Member of the House of Representatives who can answer the question, because I have asked it over and over for the past year. If there is any Member here who has the ingenuity, the initiative, and brains enough to get up here and answer the question I will yield him my time right now; and the gentleman from Illinois is the man I should like to have try to answer the question.

Mr. KELLER. I can do it.

Mr. RICH. All right. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard much about this question, Where are you going to get the money?—that I interjected the question for the purpose of answering it. It is a simple matter to get the money we need, and it always has been a simple matter. There has been much talk about balancing of the Budget, but there has not been a definition given as to what we mean by the "Budget." Somebody ought

to get up here and tell us something about it. I am going to do just that, modest as I am in making the statement.

Mr. Chairman, 4 years ago when the question of balancing the Budget came up, I went to the trouble to look up the subject with the greatest of care from the beginning of our Government to the present moment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman going to make the official answer now as to where his party is going to get the money? In other words, is he speaking officially? I mean, does the gentleman represent the Democratic Party?

Mr. KELLER. I am representing KENT E. KELLER only and that is sufficient for this time.

Since we started in we have been out of debt once in our lifetime as a Nation, and then only for a short time. That was under "Old Hickory" Jackson. That was the only time we have ever been out of debt.

On the average, every 2 years and 11 months from the beginning of our history to the present time, a full year has been a deficit year; a year in which we did not get money enough to pay our bills for that year—that is, to balance the Budget. I want you to get this, because when we go to discussing balancing the Budget and where we are going to get the money and how we are going to get the money, we ought to see what we have done in the past, because that is going to show us whether we can or whether we cannot get the money.

If we have in the past, we can in the future. Our Treasury report shows that in the 144 years of our constitutional Government from 1789 to 1933, both inclusive, there have been 49 annual deficits—a little more than one-third of the years of our national existence have been years of unbalanced Budgets. Thirteen of those years, at most, were war years. Thirty-six years of unbalanced Budgets were peacetime years. All the war years were years with unbalanced Budgets. Of the 131 years of peace, 1 year out of each 3 years and 8 months showed a deficit—that is, we did not take in as much as we spent. The whole 144-year period taken together shows that on the average 1 year out of every 2 years and 11 months has been a deficit year with its unbalanced Budget. Did all these years of unbalanced Budgets ruin our credit? Did we ever fail to pay? Certainly not.

Mr. KNUTSON. Tell us how to get the money first.

Mr. KELLER. Wait just a minute. I am going to tell you how to get the money.

Following the Civil War, this country owed a Federal indebtedness of 17½ percent of our total national wealth. Now, get that. At the close of the Civil War the United States Government owed 17½ percent of our total national wealth, and no less than that. Did it cause us to go broke in paying it? Certainly, not. We nearly paid it off before we came to the last war. We could have paid it out long ago if we had tried to, or if we had been more interested in paying off our indebtedness than in reducing the taxes of the rich people and prosperous corporations.

What next? From that time until this, or, from the close of the Civil War to the present war, we have learned how to produce about three and a half times as much wealth, man for man, as we could have done or as we did at that period. This simply shows that if we could pay 17½ percent of our national wealth at the end of the Civil War that we could, if necessary, pay three and a half times that proportion of our national wealth reckoned on our most prosperous years, if we needed to.

This is the first thing I want to get clear to you. I want you to see that this question of balancing the Budget is not only not vital but it is a piece of nonsense, in my judgment, to bring it out every time we get up here and talk about it, unless we know what we are talking about.

Now, if we have done these things in the past, we can do them in the future. I say to you, frankly, that our necessities at the present time are as great or greater than at any period in our history, even includes our periods of war. We

are under as great obligation to pay whatever taxes are necessary to take us out of these conditions, and keep us out, as we have been at any time in our entire history.

Now, you ask how are we going to pay. I want to call your attention to one more thing which I have heretofore called to the attention of this House when I was a great deal newer here than I am now, and that is this: Following the World War, if we had continued the taxes on the tax books at that time, inside of the first 10-year period we would have paid every penny we owed. If you want to verify this, get the tables prepared on this subject by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxes that serves the House and Senate together. All you have got to do is to go back to the speech delivered by my colleague from an adjoining district, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PARSONS], who submitted these facts to this body.

What did we do? I will tell you what we did. Instead of paying it when we had it to pay, we turned around in 1921 and reduced the income tax shamefully, and only a few men had the vision and the understanding to see where it was leading us. We could have paid the whole thing inside the first 10 years. We could have paid the soldiers' adjusted compensation at that time and never missed the money if Congress had desired to do that. But did they desire to? Oh, no. The Congress considered it much more desirable to serve the very rich people and the very prosperous corporations than to pay the soldiers their compensation. So they completely wiped out the excess-profits tax in 1921, because the income and excess-profits taxes alone had brought in \$4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1920, making a total national revenue income of \$6,694,000,000 for 1 year's taxes, actually collected in cash. But the tender-hearted Congress could not stand such cruelty to the war profiteers. So, to protect these friends of theirs, they put the soldiers off without a penny. Again, in 1924, the Congress reduced the income tax and gave the soldiers a rain check, good after 20 years. I am proud of the fact that this Congress has provided for cashing these rain checks 9 years before that income-tax-reducing Congress intended it should be done. Not only this, but if we had known enough to do this, we might also have known enough to prevent the panic that succeeded in 1929.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Certainly. We could have had money enough in our Treasury so that as men fell out of employment for technological reasons, we could have reemployed them in the service of this Government and there need not have been a single, solitary unemployed man in America.

Mr. KNUTSON. Where are you going to get the money?

Mr. KELLER. In just a moment I am coming to that.

There need not have been a single idle man in America, because there are at the present time, and there have been for the last 100 years, a sufficient number of national projects of permanent value to have taken up every solitary man who fell into idleness through no fault of his own.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KELLER. Surely.

Mr. SNELL. I understood the gentleman to say that he objected to the fact that they reduced the income-tax rates?

Mr. KELLER. I certainly said that.

Mr. SNELL. If I recall correctly, the reduced income-tax rates brought in more income to the Government than the former rates.

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman ought to go back and look up the record on that.

Mr. SNELL. I think that statement is correct.

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman is wrong about that.

Mr. SNELL. I think that is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Is not that statement so?

Mr. KELLER. No; it is not so. The fiscal year of 1920 brought in from income and excess-profits taxes \$4,000,000,000 in cash. After the Congress reduced the income taxes in 1921, the income from that source fell to just half that

amount in 1922 and never again reached even that figure. The gentleman will find this statement literally true from the Treasury receipts, and no statement even by Mr. Mellon can change the fact I here state.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not undertake to say that I know everything or know anything, but I simply express my own opinion—

Mr. RICH. Let Mr. Keller talk—he knows everything.

Mr. KELLER. Sure, I do—for your benefit. I am giving you what you need if you will only heed it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very sorry for my friend from Pennsylvania, who has to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] to yield to him in the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is very unfortunate, but the gentleman from Illinois has yielded to me.

We had a depression in 1920 and 1921, and, of course, the amount of income taxes was reduced during that depression. Naturally, when business came back the returns in revenue from existing law increased, and I think my distinguished friend from New York realizes that the depression of 1920–21 sharply reduced the national income, but the national income came back very rapidly because we whipped out of that depression very quickly.

Mr. SNELL. Every time the income tax has been reduced it has returned more income to the National Government.

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman from New York is mistaken, completely and entirely mistaken. I am rather suspecting my friend from New York believes the statements he hears made in the stump speeches of his party.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield with pleasure to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. From what the gentleman has said, he is going to get the money from taxation.

Mr. KELLER. Certainly. That is where all money for carrying on government comes from, always has, always will, always ought to.

Mr. GIFFORD. Is the gentleman ready to vote for those taxes?

Mr. KELLER. Certainly. When a proper tax bill is presented I will vote for it and work for it all the way down the line. Now I want to follow this up. In 1924 we again reduced the income taxes, and again we gave back by a general resolution taxes that were due, that already belonged to the people of this country. In 1926 we reduced the income tax and again gave back by joint resolution a year's taxes that belonged to the people.

Mr. SNELL. The conditions throughout the country in 1924 and 1928 were about the same.

Mr. KELLER. No.

Mr. SNELL. When we reduced the taxes in 1924 it produced more income for the National Government.

Mr. KELLER. Of course, the gentleman from New York has a perfect right to be wrong if he insists on it. But the Treasury receipts show the personal income taxes for 1924 to have been \$704,265,390 and the corporation income tax to have been \$881,549,546—a total income-tax receipts of \$1,585,814,936—the lowest receipts for any year over a 10-year period prior to 1931.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is an expert on taxation. Has he given any consideration to the cutting down of governmental expenses?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; that has been my work for many years. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MILLARD. Does not the gentleman think that he has gotten this time under false pretenses? [Laughter.] The gentleman said he was going to tell us how to get the money, and he has not started yet, and his time is almost up.

Mr. KELLER. I have answered the gentleman's question already.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Certainly.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman name one bill where he has voted to cut down governmental expenses?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; I voted for one of your bills. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman name it.

Mr. KELLER. Well, I will look it up and get the name and the number. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says he has been engaged in cutting down governmental expenses for years—does not the gentleman think that that was love's labor lost? [Laughter.]

Mr. KELLER. I do not think so. Now, to get back to this reduction of income tax. In 1928, you reduced the income tax and gave back certain taxes. In 1929, in December, when Congress met, when every man who knew anything about economic history knew that we were facing a national panic—knew that every time we have had a major stock crash on the stock market we have had a national panic, followed by a national depression. Of that there can be no doubt and is none. Yet in 1929, under those conditions, facing a panic, with men falling out of jobs every day, this Congress voted to again reduce the income taxes and give back supposedly \$160,000,000 to the successful corporations and to the successful income-tax gatherers—those who had incomes.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SNELL. How can you give back something you never have had?

Mr. KELLER. I will tell the gentleman how to give back something you never have had. Just vote as you did in 1929, when the money was due, and you voted to give it back, before it was paid. You did that in 1929, in 1928, in 1926, in 1924, and 1921.

Mr. SNELL. But I still maintain that you cannot give back something that you never have had, and I also maintain that those tax measures produced more than the others did, and I would ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], to confirm that.

Mr. KELLER. And I will bring that back to the gentleman and quote what your Secretary of the Treasury said, that whenever you put too high an income tax, the rich man will not pay. I quote from a letter from Mr. Mellon to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee dated November 10, 1923:

Ways will always be found to avoid taxes so destructive in their nature, and the only way to save the situation is to put the taxes on a reasonable basis that will permit business to go on and industry develop.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman obtained his time to tell us where they are going to get the money.

Mr. KELLER. But I have answered that question a few moments back. Through taxes, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to grant me 5 minutes more.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman obtained his time from the other side.

Mr. RICH. Give him some time, so that he can answer the question, because he has not said anything yet.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Yes, to my friend from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that during that very period, huge income-tax refunds, and one item of \$45,000,000 refunded to the Steel Trust in 1927, which was collected in 1917?

Mr. KELLER. And is it not a fact that during that period this body voted a law that originally provided that unless when you paid the income tax you protested, you had no right to go back and ask for a rebate? This body revoked that law in 1924, and they went back, and my recollection is they paid out of the Treasury of this country about \$4,000,000,000.

Mr. GIFFORD. And having reimposed all of the income taxes last year, all that we could get revenue from, if the gentleman is now going to get his money from taxes, will he tell us what kind of taxes?

Mr. KELLER. I shall be glad to do that though I by no means agree we have reimposed all the income taxes that we could get revenue from. We are going to get some more from income taxes, in my judgment.

Mr. GIFFORD. But we are getting all we can.

Mr. KELLER. Oh, no; we are not. We are going to go, in my judgment, to as low exemptions as will pay for the collection. In England they are down to as low as \$600 a year, and we will come to that right here. We are going to come to it, and we are going to take it all the way up through, and if the sixteenth amendment has not been nullified by the Court, since we are talking about the Constitution, we will enforce the law and we can get all the money that we need without hurting anybody.

We are going to take it and do not think we are not. We are not only going to take whatever tax money we need, but we are going to accept the responsibility of coming here as a government and saying to every American man and woman, "There is a job ready for every man and woman who wants to work", and we are going to see to it that they have that job, and when we do that we will produce so much wealth that there will be no longer any excuse for poverty in this country of ours. And when we guarantee a job to every man and woman who wants to work, no man now out of a job, nor who has been out of a job, nor whose job has ever been endangered, as they all have been, not a one of them will object to paying a small income tax to insure himself a job and his children after him. It will be the cheapest possible job insurance; the very greatest security to men, to business, to governmental institutions. That is the only solution for unemployment—the guaranty of an opportunity to earn a living—a competency, in fact.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. To my colleague from Massachusetts, surely, with pleasure.

Mr. TREADWAY. To ask the gentleman whether he thinks the program of taxation to which he has referred, going to the very lowest salaried people, to the point where it will simply be paying for the collections, will be a very popular tax with those in control of the Democratic Party, just before election?

Mr. KELLER. Let me suggest to the gentleman that he take that home to his own party and see what it says about it.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am asking the gentleman. He has stated in an authoritative way—

Mr. KELLER. Oh, no.

Mr. TREADWAY. What the majority party here are going to do.

Mr. KELLER. No; I am not stating any such thing.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to know whether he thinks that will make votes for his party at the coming election and if that theory will not make votes then I prophesy just as strongly that the theory that the gentleman is proposing will not be carried out by the Democratic majority.

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman may be entirely right as to that. But I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not say that I was speaking officially. I said that I was speaking for KENT E. KELLER, and nobody else.

Mr. TREADWAY. But we respect Mr. KENT KELLER's position as one of the leaders of the Democratic Party.

Mr. KELLER. I have never been so accused before. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, indicates that he judges the Democratic Party by the standards of the Republican Party. He knows that they approach a question of that kind, especially matters of taxation, with a view to the welfare of the Republican Party

and to political benefits, rather than the welfare of the country. That is the viewpoint of his party, and he just naturally assumes that the Democratic Party proceeds on the same basis as the Republican Party. That is a false assumption.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he disputes the accuracy of the statement I made?

Mr. KELLER. I do not yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TREADWAY. I said that the Democratic Party would not make this kind of taxes to which the gentleman from Illinois has referred. I stand by it, and I ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] whether he disputes that or not?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman from Illinois has been given the floor to explain where we are going to get the money. If about 40 of these curious ones would leave him alone long enough, perhaps he can tell us.

Mr. WEARIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. WEARIN. If I remember correctly, we have had about \$7,000,000,000 in emergency appropriations since the Democratic Party came into power. I believe it is true that there has been an increase of approximately \$67,000,000,000, or thereabouts, in bank deposits, national income, and things of that character since President Roosevelt came into power. That might be one way in which we could pay that debt of \$7,000,000,000.

Mr. KELLER. Certainly.

Mr. LAMBETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. LAMBETH. Does not the gentleman think that the best progress we could make toward balancing the Budget is to get the national income returned to normal, and has that not been gradually, steadily, and appreciably increasing ever since the present administration went into power on March 4, 1933?

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman has anticipated exactly what I am coming to, and I thank him for doing so. In 1928 and 1929 our national income was about \$90,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I will in just a moment. Our income fell to under \$40,000,000,000; about thirty-seven and a half billion, as I recall. We have returned it, through some method or other, to about fifty-five billion. But what I want to put to every one of you, not as a partisan matter but as a matter of common sense, is this, that the minute we return our national income we will have no trouble in paying whatever amount of taxes we may require.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And relief goes out?

Mr. KELLER. And relief goes out. The gentleman from Michigan makes a suggestion, and it is a splendid suggestion, that just as soon as we return the national income, relief goes out, naturally and properly.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Has the gentleman any figures to show whether or not the drop in national income from 1929 to 1932, and the increase from 1932 to 1936, bear any relationship to the drop and increase, respectively, of the national income in other countries, and of world income?

Mr. KELLER. Oh, yes; I have a great deal.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman put those figures in the RECORD, please?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; I will. I make this suggestion to the gentleman, that the proof of the fall of national income, the proof of panic, the proof of depression, lies in one thing, that is, the percentage of unemployment in the country. I want to call this to your attention. I am going to give you facts. The fact is that at the present time all of Europe, with its 550,000,000 people, has about six and one-quarter million unemployed. The United States, with its 127,000,000 people, has more than 10,000,000 unemployed. Can the gentleman tell us why this is true?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Despite the resourceful and beneficent administration we have had during the last 3 years?

Mr. KELLER. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. You cannot parallel them to save your soul.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. But we still have actually 11,400,000 unemployed.

Mr. KELLER. The parallel is not there.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Green last week said there were 11,400,000 out of employment. Harry Hopkins says we are going to have more on relief now than we had a year ago. If we are getting better, why the unemployment and why the greater amount of relief?

Mr. KELLER. I do not say we are getting better on unemployment. I did not say I accepted Mr. Green's figures. I gave the figure I consider conservative, although I think Mr. Green is practically right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman has made a very powerful argument and a complete answer. The answer was so complete that they now have to ask the gentleman about unemployment. I think the gentleman has made a powerful and compelling answer. [Applause and laughter.] I might make the observation that when we get back to 1929 levels with the present tax laws on the statute books, it is conservatively estimated that the Government will receive a revenue of \$8,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. KELLER. And that, of course, will enable us to do what we have to do.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman is the best pinch hitter in the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLER. I thank the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KENNEY].

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] was interrupted at considerable length by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. The gentleman from Massachusetts comes from the western part of the State, a splendid region, rich in history and great men. He seems to be worried about the new tax plan that is coming into being.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. KENNEY. I do not know whether the gentleman still reads that fine paper published in his part of the State; but if he does, he will find a suggestion which I believe up to now has gone in one ear and out the other. There is a great Republican newspaper printed in Springfield, Mass. It is the Springfield Republican; and the ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee ought perhaps to have his attention directed to what the Springfield Republican has to say.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, it reads as follows:

THE KENNEY IDEA

Representative KENNEY hails from New Jersey, and he has a bill that fits more snugly day by day into the present fiscal stringency in the United States Treasury. Mr. Kenney's message is, "Let us establish a national lottery."

Everything moves Mr. KENNEY's way. The Government lost the processing taxes. Congress passed the bonus over a veto, and that calls for over two billions. Mr. PATMAN, of Texas, and Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma would start the printing presses and make paper money to fill the void. Mr. KENNEY's idea would avoid inflation and follow an orthodox method of finance.

Yes; orthodox. France today has a national lottery which figures in the French budget as a revenue source for the Government. The French Government fails to balance its budget even with the aid of the national lottery, for the French people feel too poor to buy so many tickets as they did once upon a time. National lotteries are also sanctified by age at least, and their orthodoxy cannot be successfully challenged. Representative KENNEY scores heavily at this point.

Lottery bills are pending in our Massachusetts Legislature. Is a collision imminent, with the issue States' rights? If a national lottery were to enjoy maximum productiveness, it should enjoy a monopoly. Has Mr. KENNEY provided for one? What would the Supreme Court's decision be, if the Federal Government undertook to tax State lotteries out of existence in order to get all the lottery revenue for itself?

There is a prolottery organization somewhere; its headquarters may be in New York. People will gamble, is its great argument. The Government needs money. Keep your eye on KENNEY, of New Jersey.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption now? Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will not the gentleman yield to me in view of the fact he mentioned my name in the very beginning of his remarks? He has time remaining, and it would seem that he should yield out of courtesy.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, on Friday last I introduced a resolution requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish the House of Representatives with the names and addresses and the amount paid to each producer exceeding \$2,000 in each calendar year pursuant to the A. A. A. I did this for the purpose of getting information which it is absolutely necessary for this House to have in order intelligently to appreciate the racketeering that has been going on under the A. A. A.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that 3 or 4 weeks ago Barron's Weekly carried a statement to the effect that a certain citizen of Jersey City, N. J., feeding pigs on the slops of New York, was awarded \$48,752 of Federal money as an inducement for reducing his production of pigs from 13,118 to 9,838?

Mr. TABER. I have heard of that instance, and I have heard of other instances running more than that. I have heard of many instances running as much as \$50,000 or \$75,000.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Does the gentleman believe that it was the purpose of Congress in passing the Agricultural Adjustment Act to give the Secretary of Agriculture power to use the proceeds of processing taxes, wrung from the hungry, in a way that does not help a single bona-fide farmer but helps slop feeders who are not farmers, who produce pigs in competition with farmers?

Mr. TABER. It was represented that the Agricultural Adjustment Act would help the real farmer and not the fellow who owned great big plantations, and men of tremendous wealth. It has been used as a racketeering proposition right along, and it is absolutely ridiculous to let it go on this way.

I hope the Committee on Agriculture will report this resolution favorably that we may have this information in detail so we may know exactly how bad it is. We know that there are hundreds and hundreds of cases. When it was put up to the House the other day the millionaire plantation owners were able to control the majority on the Democratic side of the House.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I hope the gentleman's resolution passes because I am convinced it is the only way in which we can exact from the Department of Agriculture information as to what has become of the people's money. I may say to the gentleman from New York that I wrote the A. A. A. upon receiving the information I have just given to the House, asking for a confirmation or denial and for data showing what other similar amounts had been awarded persons in different parts of the country. I was refused this information, the specious reason being given that it would entail too much labor in the Department to supply it; and then the significant statement was added that, in any event, even if the information were readily available, it would not be

given to me, although I am a Member of Congress, unless the Secretary of Agriculture gave his approval.

Mr. TABER. That shows the dictatorial power that the Secretary of Agriculture has attained.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] said that he saw with his own eyes a thousand Government hogs dumped into the Mississippi River. This is an oft-repeated statement, and it deserves investigation.

Hogs, of course, are supposed to have been in that allotment bought by the Government under the emergency action of a year or two ago.

Before the subcommittee on the agricultural appropriation bill last year there appeared Dr. Mohler, head of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture. Dr. Mohler is not a politician. He is the responsible head of an important bureau of the Department of Agriculture, and he testified as to these widely circulated reports. I want to produce the testimony of Dr. Mohler.

The Bureau of Animal Industry, may I say, supervised the slaughter of 6,000,000 hogs bought by the Government. Eighty-eight million pounds of pork resulting from the slaughter of these hogs were distributed to relief agencies throughout the country. The smaller pigs were used for fertilizer purposes and for grease.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read just a few excerpts from Dr. Mohler's testimony:

Mr. CANNON (the acting chairman of the committee today). Now, right here, doctor, if I may interrupt you, the charge has sometimes been made in connection with the A. A. A. hog reduction program that these hogs to which you refer, instead of being duly processed, either for meat products or for fertilizer, were thrown into the Mississippi River. What is your information on that subject, doctor?

Dr. MOHLER. We have heard reports and seen publications of that kind in the newspapers of the country, and in each case where such a claim was brought to our attention we have had an investigation made, but in no case have we found where such an occurrence has taken place.

Mr. CANNON. You can state, then, positively that any reports to the effect that hogs bought under the program and delivered to St. Louis and East St. Louis plants were thrown into the river are without any foundation whatever?

Dr. MOHLER. Absolutely; without any foundation.

The report of the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. SHORT, has apparently never been submitted to the Department of Agriculture. I now call upon him, in the interest of accuracy, and in the interest of clearing up this problem, to produce the evidence as to the time and the place where he saw these hogs cast into the river, how he knew they were Government hogs, whether they were privately owned hogs or not, to the end that the Bureau of Animal Industry may investigate and report to this body with reference to the truth of the report. Having said he was an eyewitness to this affair, I should like to have my colleague now furnish the complete and exact data.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOM. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Would not the fact that this vast amount of pork was cast into the river cause pollution and be a violation of the State law?

Mr. THOM. I should think so, but I am not advised.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOM. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. May I say, Mr. Chairman, it is such common knowledge out in my State and in Illinois the Government did this that everyone takes judicial knowledge of the fact. These reports were printed in both the St. Louis Post Dispatch and the St. Louis Globe Democrat, and if I had time I think I could secure affidavits from people who live in that vicinity to corroborate the statement that I made. It is my understanding that the Government did not slaughter any pigs for pork purposes unless they weighed over 80 pounds. The smaller pigs, of course, were

slaughtered for use for soap and fertilizer. Members of this House will testify that this occurred in their respective districts, just as it did in connection with the dairy cattle purchased in Wisconsin at \$10 a head, which were worth \$100 a head. Down in my county, at Hurley, Mo., they canned cattle. Much of it spoiled, and they gave the canned meat to the farmers to feed to the pigs in order to raise more pigs to knock in the head. I have repeatedly driven from my home to Chicago during both years of the exposition, and in going through St. Louis and East St. Louis, Ill., I saw truck load after truck load going down there. I do not know whether the employees will testify for fear of losing their jobs.

Mr. THOM. The gentleman said he saw them dumped into the river. Will he repeat that statement?

Mr. SHORT. I said I saw them with my own eyes being hauled down to the river.

Mr. THOM. Did the gentleman see them dumped into the river?

Mr. SHORT. I did not see them actually dumped into the river.

Mr. THOM. That is what the gentleman said just recently?

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman would not allow me time enough to go into the matter. I think everybody knows it. The gentleman will not deny that more than six and a half million pigs were slaughtered under that program.

Mr. THOM. No.

Mr. SHORT. He will not deny that 400,000 brood sows were likewise slaughtered under that program?

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. The gentleman from Missouri made a definite, precise statement in this House, and he is not going to wiggle out of it. I repeat his statement: "I can inform the gentleman", meaning myself, "I saw with my own eyes a thousand of them dumped into the Mississippi River."

Is that rhetoric, is it exaggeration, or is it inspiration? Will the gentleman answer?

Mr. SHORT. It is information.

Mr. THOM. Does the gentleman now say "yes" or "no"?

Mr. SHORT. I saw them being hauled in trucks down there.

Mr. THOM. Did the gentleman see them dumped into the river?

Mr. SHORT. I did not see them actually poured into the river.

Mr. THOM. All right; then the gentleman withdraws the statement?

Mr. SHORT. It makes no difference whether they were poured into the river or buried. They were destroyed. That is the significant point.

Mr. THOM. Did the gentleman see them destroyed?

Mr. SHORT. Where did they go? What became of them?

Mr. THOM. The gentleman made the charge.

Mr. SHORT. I want to ask the gentleman what became of them.

Mr. THOM. You made the charge.

Mr. SHORT. Do you deny they were destroyed?

Mr. THOM. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. SHORT. Oh, complete ignorance is bliss.

Mr. THOM. I am asking you to prove your statement.

Mr. SHORT. No; but they were slaughtered, and God only knows where they went.

Mr. THOM. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to lecture this House, but I am tired, sick, and weary of unfortified statements going into this Record. Let us keep to the truth, and when a Member of this House comes in here and testifies about what he has seen and states of his own knowledge that he saw 1,000 pigs dumped into the river, and then backs down as the gentleman from Missouri has done, it is time to call a halt out of respect for the integrity of this Record. [Applause.]

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein a por-

tion of the second McGroarty bill, page 2, lines 1 to 25, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on January 27 I discussed the Townsend plan upon the floor of this House. I gave the cost of that plan on a per-capita basis to the townships, cities, and counties of my district; to my district as a whole, to the city of Detroit, and to the State of Michigan. I compared that cost with the population and the assessed valuation of each township, city, and county, and with my district as a whole. These figures show that the annual cost of the Townsend plan ranges from 21.3 percent to 39.6 percent of the assessed valuation of such counties. These figures further show that this plan would cost Michigan each year upon a per-capita basis \$944,253,375, or approximately \$144,000,000 more each year than the total debt of my State, including the debt of every political subdivision within that State. I pointed out that this plan would cost the city of Detroit more than \$305,000,000 each year, or approximately three-fourths of its entire bonded indebtedness. Many of these municipalities have been unable to pay these bonds in 20 or 25 annual installments. I gave my reasons for figuring the cost upon a per-capita basis. Some organizers and some Townsend papers have criticized my method of computation. I now ask them in all fairness to answer these questions. If this tax cannot be figured fairly upon a per-capita basis, or upon the basis that the consumer pays, what is the fair basis upon which it can be figured so the average workingman, farmer, or taxpayer can learn just how much it is going to cost him each year? If it is not going to cost the State of Michigan \$944,000,000 each year, just how much is it going to cost that State annually? If it is not going to cost the city of Detroit \$305,000,000 each year, and if it is not going to cost the Ninth Congressional District of Michigan \$41,000,000 each year, just how much is it going to cost the city of Detroit or the Ninth District annually if we pass this law? Surely, if the proponents of the Townsend plan ask the people of my district to accept a law and to pay a tax levied under that law, the people are entitled to know how much it will cost and how they are going to pay that cost before they support that law.

In my speech of January 27, 1936—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1064—I discussed the Townsend plan as advocated by Dr. Townsend in his weekly and in his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and the Finance Committee of the Senate. I stated specifically that I was not discussing the McGroarty bills.

I now desire to discuss the second McGroarty bill, H. R. 7154, which was introduced on April 1, 1935. This is the only bill receiving any support in the House by any Member, including Dr. Townsend's own friends and supporters.

Section 2 of this bill reads in part as follows:

There is hereby levied a tax of 2 percent on the fair gross dollar value of each transaction done within the United States and Territories.

Section 1 reads in part as follows:

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. The term "transaction" for the purposes of this act shall be defined so as to include the sale, barter, and/or exchange of either or both real or personal property, including any right, interest, easement, or privilege of commercial value therein or related thereto, whether actually made at the time or only then agreed to be made and whether under executed or executory contract or otherwise; also including all charges for interest, rent commissions, fees, and any other pecuniary benefit of any kind directly or indirectly derived from or for any loan, deposit, rental, lease, pledge, or any other use or forbearance of money or property; and also including the rendering or performance of any service for monetary or other commercially valuable consideration, whether by a person or otherwise, including all personal service, also transportation by any means, and telephone, telegraph, radio, amusement, recreation, education, art, advertising, any public utility, any water rights, and/or any and all other service of any and every kind whatsoever, but excepting and excluding therefrom any single isolated transfer of property of fair value less than \$100 which does not arise or occur in the usual course of an established commercial business and excluding any loan, deposit, withdrawal from deposit, hypothecation, or pledge of property or money.

LXXX—171

Section 2 requires each citizen or legal entity who comes under the act to make a return not later than 10 days after the expiration of each calendar month, and that all taxes levied for each month must be paid before the expiration of the succeeding month. I have tried to analyze this bill to determine just how it would affect the various interests in my district and in my State. Many of the aged people writing me have been informed that in some vague way the cost of this plan will be paid by Wall Street, by the bankers, the stock exchange, and by men of wealth. In fact they are informed that only a small part of the tremendous cost of this plan would be paid by the farmer and wage-earner. I want to disabuse their mind of this idea. An analysis shows that the major part of this cost will be paid by the farmer, wage earner, and small business man.

Let us consider first, just how does this transaction tax operate? Let us take a concrete example. The farmer sells his wheat to the elevator. A 2-percent tax is levied. The elevator sells it to the miller. Another 2-percent tax is levied. The miller grinds it into flour and sells the flour to the wholesaler. Another 2 percent is levied. The wholesaler sells it to the retailer. Another 2 percent tax is levied. The retailer sells that flour back to the farmer and he pays another 2 percent plus all the taxes levied (a total of 10 percent) from the time it left his hands as wheat until it gets back to his hands as flour. In addition a 2-percent tax is levied on all pay rolls, freight, and other charges for service or material, all of which, except the pay-roll tax, is added to the cost the farmer pays. The same is true when he sells a cow hide or wool and later buys it back manufactured into shoes, harness, or clothing. The wage earner, merchant, or other citizen will pay, of course, the same pyramided tax under this bill that the farmer pays.

Dr. Robert L. Doane, Dr. Townsend's economist and statistician, in testifying before the Ways and Means Committee of the House—page 1109—stated that:

The findings of the biennial census of manufacturers indicate a turn-over of approximately three times once the raw materials get into the manufacturing process. Of course, it varies. Sometimes it may be 12 or 16 times; in other cases only once.

In other words, Dr. Doane states that there may be from 1 to 16 transactions while the raw material is going through the manufacturing process, each carrying with it a 2-percent tax. He further states that the turn-over after manufacturing is about three times and the average number of transactions six. This means that the consumer pays a 12-percent tax on each article purchased. It does not take into consideration the tax paid on freight, telephone, and electric light bills, a pyramided tax paid on materials, and so forth, nor the 2-percent tax levied against the pay roll which is paid by the wage earner.

HOW THE TRANSACTION TAX WOULD AFFECT THE FARMER

With these facts in mind, let us assume that I want to start farming. Just how would that tax affect me, first, in getting started and, second in operating my farm. Let us assume that I bought an 80-acre farm for \$8,000 on terms of \$3,000 cash, the balance secured by a \$5,000 mortgage; that this mortgage is payable \$500 and interest each year. The tax bill on this farm would read something like this:

Original transaction, 2 percent on \$8,000 purchase price, \$160; 10 payments of interest at 6 percent, totaling \$1,650, at a 2-percent tax, \$33.

I would also have to pay a 2-percent tax on the real-estate tax I paid on the farm. Assuming that the tax was \$150 a year, or \$1,500 for the 10 years, another \$30 tax on tax would be levied, \$30.

I also have to purchase a team, stock, and equipment. That tax bill would read something like this: One team, \$300; six cows, \$300 (purchased direct from other farmers). Total, \$600, at 2-percent tax, \$12.

Tools, binder, mower, wagon, and so forth, \$1,000, at a pyramided tax of 12 percent, \$120. Grand total, \$355.

This would make a total tax paid on the farm and equipment of \$355.

Next, how will this tax affect the operation of my farm?

First. I pay from 2 to 12 percent tax on all the seed I buy, depending on whether I buy direct or through a retailer.

Second. I deduct and pay 2 percent on all wages I pay my hired help.

Third. I pay from 2 to 12 percent on all groceries, clothing, and so forth.

Fourth. I pay 12 percent on all additional farm machinery, replacements, or repairs.

Fifth. I pay from 2 to 12 percent on all fertilizer.

Sixth. I pay 2 percent on my telephone, telegraph, freight, and electric-light bills.

Seventh. I pay at least 6 percent on my coal bill, plus a 2-percent tax on the freight charges.

Eighth. If I buy an auto or truck, I have to pay a pyramided tax of 12 percent on the purchase price, on all repairs, equipment, gas, oil, and grease. This in addition to taxes I now pay, upon which I pay another 2-percent tax.

Ninth. If I rent land for cash or on shares, I pay a 2-percent tax on the cash rent paid or on the value of the crop rent.

Tenth. When I pay my life, fire, auto, or windstorm insurance premiums, I must add a 2-percent tax. If I take out a new policy, I pay 2-percent tax on face of the policy.

Eleventh. If my family is sick, I pay a 2-percent tax on the doctor's services, medicine, and nurse's bill.

In addition to this, I pay from 2 to 12 percent on everything I buy, of whatever nature not herein specified.

Now, what else do I have to do? Under the McGroarty bill I must make a report before the tenth day of each and every month of everything I sell, whether retail or wholesale. I must add 2 percent to the selling price of everything, including butter, eggs, cream, wheat, rye, hay, pork, beef, cotton, beans, and so forth. If I swap horses, I pay a 2-percent tax on the horse I swap.

If anyone owes me money, I pay a 2-percent tax on any interest he pays me.

How would you like to go back at the end of the session and explain a "yes" vote on this bill to the farmer after he had been operating under it for 6 months?

HOW THE TRANSACTION TAX WILL AFFECT THE WAGE EARNER

First. His employer deducts 2 percent transaction tax each pay day from his wages. This is in addition to the 3 percent the employer will deduct from those wages when the social security bill is in full force for unemployment insurance.

Second. He pays a pyramided tax of approximately 12 percent on each article of food, clothing, fuel, and so forth, he buys for himself and family.

Third. He pays a 2-percent tax on the rent.

Fourth. He pays a 2-percent tax on all insurance premiums, including automobile, life, and fire. If he takes out a new policy, he pays a 2-percent tax on the face value.

Fifth. If he has purchased a home, he pays a 2-percent tax on the purchase price, another 2 percent on payments of interest as it falls due. He pays a 2-percent tax on fire-insurance premiums on the dwelling and a 2-percent tax on the real-estate tax levied against his home.

Sixth. If he or a member of his family is sick, he pays a 2-percent tax on the doctor bill, nurse's fees, medicine, hospital bills, and so forth.

Seventh. If he owns an automobile, he pays a 2- to 12-percent tax on gas, oil, repairs, purchase price, plus a 2-percent tax on all other taxes now levied.

Eighth. He pays a 2-percent tax on all telephone, telegraph, gas, and electric-light bills.

Ninth. If I have forgotten anything else he buys, just insert it with a 2-percent to 12-percent tax.

How would you like to explain a "yes" vote on the McGroarty bill after the workingman has been operating under it for about 6 months?

HOW THE TRANSACTION TAX WILL AFFECT THE RETAIL MERCHANT

First. He would have to pay 2-percent tax on the interest paid on any note or mortgage he gives each time he borrows money to carry on his business.

Second. He pays a 2-percent tax on all real estate, automobile, or other taxes he now pays.

Third. He pays from 2 to 12 percent tax on all stock and equipment purchased.

Fourth. He pays a 2-percent tax on all freight bills, telephone, telegraph, and electric-light bills.

Fifth. He pays a 10-percent transaction tax on the income tax he pays the Federal or State Government, if any.

Sixth. He pays a pyramided transaction tax of from 2 to 12 percent on all goods he purchases. Tax paid on goods resold is passed on to consumer.

Seventh. He pays a 2-percent tax on all wages paid employees. (This tax is deducted from wage earner's pay.)

Eighth. He pays a pyramided tax on all fuel, operating expenses, and supplies of from 2 to 12 percent.

Ninth. He makes a return of all merchandise sold before the 10th of each month for the preceding month.

Tenth. In addition to the above, he would pay every tax that the workingman would pay on his home expenses enumerated under the workingman's list.

COMMENT

The chain-stores system, which purchases in large quantities direct from the producer, eliminates one or more transactions, and therefore eliminates part of the transaction tax. Four hundred and fifty retail hardware merchants went out of business in Michigan during the last 10 years. If this bill passes, it will give the chain store another advantage over the independent merchant and will force thousands of independent merchants out of business because of inability to compete with the chain stores.

HOW THE TRANSACTION TAX WILL AFFECT BANKS AND BANK ACCOUNTS

The bill is rather indefinite as to just how far it applies to banks. The act specifically exempts loans, deposits, and withdrawal from deposits. If by withdrawal from deposits it includes, as contended by some of its supporters, only savings deposits and that the law applies to checking accounts, then it is indeed far reaching. Let us assume I have a working capital of \$1,000 cash, which I am leaving in the bank as a checking account. Every time I draw a check, that \$1,000 becomes smaller because the bank has to deduct a 2-percent tax. If I sold \$50,000 in goods during the year and put the money through the bank, the transaction tax on my bank checks would wipe out my \$1,000 balance in 1 year. One of my critics, who is also a friend, is the organizing manager of the Townsend movement in my congressional district. Some time ago he wrote a letter to various papers, stating that the bank clearings in 1929—which is the business level they are trying to reach—showed transactions of \$714,240,000,000.

Quoting this gentleman, he says:

Everybody knows that not more than half of the transactions were reported through the banks; so if you will multiply this amount by 2, you will have \$1,428,840,000,000, which would indicate that the dollar turned over about 300 times that year.

This friend of mine is going to levy apparently a 2-percent transaction tax each time the dollar turns over. In other words, he is going to tax each dollar 2 percent 300 times each year and make that dollar pay \$6 in taxes. I never knew the dollar to be so prolific. My friend would have to cross-breed the dollar with a guinea pig to make it reproduce itself six times each year. He states that I do not understand this plan. I am frank to confess that when you begin to talk about trillions you are beyond me and that I cannot understand that kind of arithmetic. The same logic applies to the transactions on the stock exchange. How long do you suppose the banks and the stock exchange would be in existence under this law? How long would you collect a 2-percent transaction tax on bank and stock turnovers? How long would your bank account and my bank account last? My friend and colleague the gentleman from the Third Congressional District of Michigan—and he is my friend—said in his speech on the floor of the House on January 27 that this transaction tax was a "mild capital levy." Well, a tax that wipes out a dollar six times each year does not appeal to me as being a "mild capital levy." To be perfectly frank and candid, it is my conviction that my friend, Dr. Townsend's organization manager in my dis-

trict, is mistaken. While everything he says about turn-overs would apply to the stock exchange, the McGroarty bill certainly exempts bank loans, savings deposits and withdrawals from deposits, and, I believe, commercial accounts.

HOW THE TRANSACTION TAX WILL AFFECT THE MANUFACTURER

First. He would have to pay a 2-percent transaction tax on the interest he pays on any notes or mortgages given each time he borrows money to carry on his business.

Second. He would have to pay a pyramided tax of from 2 to 32 percent—if the biennial Census of Manufactures quoted by Dr. Doane is right—on raw material while it is put through the manufacturing process. This would be added to the cost of production.

Third. Then he would have to deduct 2 percent on all pay rolls in addition to the 9.6 percent paid under the social security bill when in full force for unemployment insurance. The 6.6 percent he must absorb. The 5 percent is taken from the wage earner.

Fourth. He pays 2 percent on all freight, telephone, telegraph, and electric-light bills.

Fifth. He pays 2-percent tax on all taxes paid to the county, State, city, and school districts, and so forth.

Sixth. He pays 2-percent tax on all corporation taxes, fees, and so forth.

Seventh. He pays a 10-percent transaction tax on any income tax he may pay the Federal or State Governments.

Eighth. He must make a return of all goods sold before the 10th of each month for the preceding month.

There are 750 paper mills in America, including 3 in my district. Due to keen foreign competition, from 50 to 60 percent of these are in the hands of receivers, trying to get on their feet financially. Ask the owners and operators whether they think they could absorb this tax. The fact is that practically every one of these 750 paper mills would close down and their employees be thrown upon the welfare if they have to add this additional burden to the cost of production. The copper and iron mines of the Upper Peninsula of my State could not operate and one-half of that area would have to be abandoned. What is true of the paper, iron, and copper industries in my State is true of hundreds of industries throughout the United States.

HOW THE TAX WOULD AFFECT THE STATE, TOWNSHIP, CITY, COUNTY, AND SCHOOL-DISTRICT GOVERNMENTS

A 2-percent tax would be deducted from all fees and salaries paid the county, township, city, and school officers, including school teachers. A pyramided tax of from 2 to 12 percent would have to be paid on all supplies bought, and a 2-percent tax added to the amount of taxes paid by every taxpayer.

The State would have to deduct a 2-percent tax on all salaries paid. In Michigan, this tax would amount to more than \$500,000 annually. The State would also have to pay a pyramided tax of from 2 percent to 12 percent on all food, clothing, fuel, and supplies purchased to feed and care for the thousands of inmates in its various institutions. It would have to pay a similar tax on supplies, wages, salaries, and so forth, purchased and paid in the operation of its university, teachers' colleges, or other educational institutions. In other words, it would increase the cost of State and local government from 12 percent to 20 percent. This additional cost would ultimately have to be paid by the taxpayer.

"But", my friends say, "we are going to increase business." Just permit me to leave this thought with you. What is the difference in the amount of business done between these two cases. In the first case, each of 12 men spends \$200 a year, the 12 spending \$2,400. In the second case, each of 11 men gives his \$200 each year to the twelfth who spends the entire \$2,400. The latter case is the McGroarty bill in operation. Eleven men give their \$200 to the twelfth who spends it, but after all, in each case the amount spent is the same.

This is the most far-reaching tax bill ever presented to any legislative body. You are taxed and retaxed from the second you are born until after you are dead. Your father pays a tax on the doctor and hospital bills, nurse's fees when you come into the world. He pays a tax on the soap with which you are washed; the clothes they put on you.

You are taxed and taxed and taxed again each minute of the day from then on until you die. Even then they refuse to stop. They tax the coffin into which they place you. They tax the undertaker's fee for embalming you, and he pays a tax on the embalming fluid. They tax the hearse that takes you on the last ride and they tax the driver's wages. They tax the lot in which you are buried. They tax the grave digger's wages for digging your grave, and the grave digger pays a tax on the pick and shovel with which he digs your grave. They tax the preacher's salary who preaches your funeral sermon. They tax the coal with which they heat the church, and the mourners have to pay a tax on the crepe they wear when they follow your casket. If you want a tombstone, you pay a tax on that. They tax the probate judge's fee who probates your will, the administrator's fees who administers it and then they start in on your heirs. The only consolation you have is that you cannot kick on the taxes you pay after you are dead.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE MCGROARTY BILL

Now let us determine just how we are going to enforce this law if enacted. The act requires the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Collector of Internal Revenue among other things to do the following:

First. He or they must require and secure the proper spending of annuity money as required by law within 5 days after the expiration of the month for which annuity is paid.

Second. He or they must require adequate and sufficient accounting of money spent, which means, of course, a monthly return by the annuitant.

Third. He or they must create or maintain boards within the several States to administer the law.

Fourth. He or they must create or maintain boards of review within the several States to review the law.

Fifth. He or they must issue, promulgate, and enforce proper and suitable rules and regulations governing the manner and place of registration of applicants for annuities.

Sixth. He or they must see that the annuitant does not give away more than 10 percent of the annuity each month.

Seventh. He or they must see that the money is not spent for unreasonable and unnecessary maintenance of any able-bodied person in idleness.

Eighth. He or they must see that no money is used to unreasonably and unnecessarily employ a person or persons, and that no payment is made to any person of any salary or wages in disproportion to the service rendered.

Ninth. He or they must determine whether the annuitant has refused to pay any just obligation.

Tenth. If annuitant has income of less than \$2,400 per year not derived from personal service, he or they shall determine what his income is and pay an annuity of the difference between the annuitant's actual income and the amount paid other annuitants.

Eleventh. He or they must provide for methods of identification and registration of annuitants.

Twelfth. He or they must see that eight or ten million annuitants do not engage in gainful occupation.

Thirteenth. All taxes shall be deemed levied and become payable on all transactions occurring 30 days after the act takes effect.

These are only a few of the duties imposed upon the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Collector of Internal Revenue, and the Secretary of the Treasury. Some job! Think of eight or ten million reports coming into an office monthly made by aged people, many of whom are too feeble to write. Think of the condition and the form of those reports. Think of the required monthly reports from millions of farmers, garage men, gas stations, merchants, manufacturers, banks, businessmen of all kinds, individuals, corporations, townships, cities, counties, boards, commissions from 48 States and from the United States Government itself. Think of the United States Government reporting every transaction, pay check, and purchase and paying a tax thereon. The United States Government is not exempt under the provisions of this act. The only exemption I find—and that is only partial—applies to the

banker and bank deposits. Think of these millions of reports coming into an office, accounting monthly for every transaction from the sale of the Woolworth building down to a 10-cent sale made in that building. Reports accounting for every dollar paid in salary or wages in the United States, whether it be to the President or to a hod carrier. Reports accounting for every dollar of taxes paid in whatever form by every taxpayer in America and paying a tax on that tax. Every interest charge, telephone, telegraph, electric light, and freight bill is included. It is impossible to begin to describe the extent of this law.

Mr. Glen J. Hudson, of Oakland, Calif., one of Dr. Townsend's experts, a leader in this movement and one of the framers of the second McGroarty bill, testified at the committee hearings that in 1929 the United States did \$1,200,000,000,000 worth of business. Mr. Hudson further testified that in 1929 each dollar was used 132.70 times, according to the New York banks. He quoted the Research Division of the Federal Reserve Board and Dow Jones as his authority.

This is twelve hundred billion dollars' worth of total business transactions each year. If the average of each transaction were \$100, it would mean that someone would have to make and check over returns on over 12,000,000,000 transactions each year in 12 monthly installments. Imagine the field force and office force necessary to check over these reports 12 times each year to see that 12,000,000,000 transactions representing \$1,200,000,000,000 were properly accounted for, the amounts properly computed, and the tax properly paid monthly. I will say to General Hines or Secretary Morgenthau, "Gentlemen, you have some job. If you get away with it, all I can say is 'What a man!'" Consider the tremendous expense and cost of administering and enforcing this law. I believe I am conservative in saying that a small part of that cost and expense would pay a real pension to the aged of our land.

I am merely pointing out the absolute and utter absurdity of the proposed law and the impossibility of enforcing it. I want to ask the most enthusiastic supporter of either the Townsend plan or the McGroarty bill how long he or she thinks the general public would stand for an enforcement of a law of this kind. If this law is ever passed and any attempt is made to enforce it, you will see many a tax collector tarred and feathered and driven out of town. We had a little experience in Michigan in 1933. We passed an old-age pension bill and made provision that the money be raised with a head tax. The legislature appropriated enough money to take the census of old people. They took that census, but when they tried to collect the head tax it was so unpopular that no one dared make the collection. Not enough money was taken in to pay the expenses of taking the census, and certainly none with which to pay the pension. The administration which was responsible for that law was defeated at the next election, and that head tax was one of the factors of that defeat. Right here is where I want to ask the people of my district who have joined a Townsend club, "How many of you paid that little \$2 head tax? I paid mine. Did you pay yours?" You know and I know that if this law is ever passed it will make the old-age pension so unpopular that it will be years before that cause will regain the ground it will have lost. It will put us back to where we were 15 years ago when as a member of the Michigan State Senate I first advocated an old-age pension. Some of the Members of Congress are wondering whether they can be reelected if they vote against the McGroarty bill or oppose the Townsend old-age-pension plan. I am wondering whether they can be reelected if they vote for this bill or support the Townsend plan.

I want to comment on just one other feature of the old-age pension. Some 14 years ago I spoke in a little town in my district on Memorial Day. There were 168 Civil War veterans located in that community on land given them by the Government as a bounty. They had cleared the forest, built their schools, their churches, their homes, and turned that wilderness into a successful farming community. All but a few of these old soldiers are now sleeping on the hill-

side. They fought to make this country a better place in which to live for themselves, their children, and their grandchildren. They fought to preserve the Union just as the old Confederate veteran fought for what he believed to be the rights of his State. Many times I have heard some of these old veterans, as their family was growing up, say, "I want my children to have a better chance in life than I had. I don't want my children to work as hard as I have had to work." Today their children and in some instances their grandchildren have joined a Townsend Club in their community. I have a family, and as a husband and father, I have two ambitions in life. One is to save enough money so the mother of my children and I will be independent in our old age. In other words, I want for myself and my wife old-age security. The other ambition I have is to give my children a good start in life. I think every father and mother has these two ambitions—old-age security and the desire to have their children do well. I do not believe there is a father or mother, a grandfather or grandmother, who would do anything to handicap in any way their children or grandchildren as they go through life.

After all, there are, according to the 1930 Census, 122 million people in America. Approximately 10 million of these will benefit by an old-age pension. The other 112 million will have to pay the cost of the old-age pension. Who are these 112 million people? They are the children and grandchildren of the first 10 million.

Is there one among those 112 million people who is so ungrateful, so selfish, so devoid of feeling and of love to those to whom he or she owe their very existence, that he or she does not want to do their share toward giving the old father and mother or grandfather or grandmother that security in old age to which they are entitled? On the other hand, is there one of the 10 million aged who is so selfish that he or she can ask for a sum that is larger than is necessary to give them that security in old age, a sum which under this bill will be so large that to raise it, it will require the taxation and retaxation many times of every article purchased by their children for themselves and their grandchildren. I still believe in that old Grandpa and Grandma who always got more joy and happiness in giving than in receiving. I don't believe that the aged of our land want that sort of a law. I don't believe that sort of a tax is necessary. I believe we can have old-age security without it. That law should be so simple that the average person can understand it; so definite in its terms that everyone will know just how much they will receive, how much they will pay, and how they will pay it. I stand ready and willing to support such a law.

In conclusion, let me repeat what I said in my speech of January 27:

Would it not be wonderful if on the first day of every month an old couple could go to the post office and get a check for \$60? Would it not be a wonderful thing if they could depend upon that amount monthly, without strings attached as to spending but to spend as the pensioners saw fit and without having Government employees coming into their homes to see what the money was spent for? Not perhaps everything that we would like, but a beginning. I recognize the absolute inadequacy of the present law. I am willing to do everything I can to bring about the passage of a law which will place a definite sum into the hands of every aged person on the first day of every month, commencing not next year, or the year after, but now.

[Applause.]

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. MAIN. Does the gentleman realize that at the bottom of page 2 of the McGroarty bill there is an exception whereby any single isolated transfer of property of fair value less than \$100 which does not arise in the usual course of an established business is exempt from the operations of the bill?

Mr. ENGEL. I am putting that section in as it is, but an isolated transfer does not include the matter of insurance or a man's wages or a man's grocery bill.

Mr. GREEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. GREEVER. I am interested in what the gentleman is saying, and would like to know if he has ever estimated

how many people it would require to carry out the terms of the bill?

Mr. ENGEL. It would be impossible for me to estimate that. It is impossible to carry it out, in my judgment, to account for \$1,200,000,000 in transaction and check over every pay roll annually.

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. MAIN. Does the gentleman realize that even though he spent his whole congressional salary of \$10,000 per year in his own community he would pay only \$200 as a direct tax into the Treasury of the United States for the purpose of financing the Townsend old-age plan?

Mr. ENGEL. And I would pay 12 percent on everything that I buy. I would pay 10 percent tax on any income tax I pay.

I would have to pay 2 percent tax on my rent, on my life insurance, and everything, according to the statement of Dr. Doane.

Mr. MAIN. But does not the gentleman realize that he would pay directly only 2 percent of his entire salary or his income to the support of this plan?

Mr. ENGEL. The law provides for a 2-percent tax on all salaries. I have no objection to that. I maintain a man drawing \$10,000 a year salary could better afford to pay 10 percent of that salary than the wage earner could afford to pay that 2 percent.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And how much would the gentleman take indirectly?

Mr. ENGEL. I have enumerated that in this talk. They would pay from 2 to 12 on everything that they buy, including rent, electric-light bill, everything. It is entirely too broad.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman mentions the cost in Detroit, Mich. Is it the gentleman's contention that that money is to be withdrawn from that community and not to be respent there?

Mr. ENGEL. Here is my contention. What is the difference between these two cases? If it is the question of increasing business, suppose you have 12 men and each one of them spends \$200 a year. That would be \$2,400. Suppose 11 of them give their \$200 to the twelfth man and he spends the \$2,400. That is the McGroarty bill. It would not, in my judgment, increase the total business transactions as the total amount spent would be the same.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. I am not sure that I get the gentleman's argument. As I understand it, it seems to be the gentleman's contention that because under the McGroarty bill a person pays 2 percent on his salary, 2 percent on this thing that he buys, 2 percent on this thing that he needs, 2 percent on his rent, that all of those 2 percents together would run his tax up several hundred percent. The fact is that that is not the case, obviously. If everything that you have to buy is increased by 2 percent or 10 percent under the McGroarty bill, then is it not true that the ultimate tax burden would be that increase of 10 percent or 2 percent or whatever you say it is in the cost of your living? I ask the gentleman if he can make anything except that out of it?

Mr. ENGEL. I think the gentleman will find the answer to his question in what I have already said. I have tried to state heretofore exactly what the wage earner, the farmer, the merchant, and so forth, will pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in an Associated Press dispatch carried in many newspapers on Saturday afternoon there appears an outburst from a gentleman who, in the absence of a more appropriate name, I shall refer to as Cotton Ed. Cotton Ed, it seems, has always posed as the representative of the southern cotton farmer. Just what grounds he has upon which to base the claim of his friendship for the southern cotton farmer I am not advised.

It seems that this House, in the passage of the bill on Friday of last week, offended Cotton Ed by including in

that bill some provision for the tenant and sharecropper class who, until that amendment had been included in the bill, were apparently not going to receive any benefits as the result of its passage, although it involved the paying out in benefits to the farmers of the country, who were the owners of land, of approximately a half a billion dollars.

The House of Representatives, as I have said, made some provision in the bill for this class of our agricultural population. It was not so definite a provision as in my judgment should have been made, but it at least directed the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture and those under him to the fact that Congress did intend that the tenant sharecropper class of farmers should not be ignored in the administration of this bill. There appears no reason why a real friend of the farmer, such as Cotton Ed has claimed to be over a long period of years, should have become excited because of the inclusion in this bill of such a manifestly just provision, but in the Associated Press article to which I have referred it is stated that the gentleman in question "bristled and roared" when his attention was called to this provision, and among other statements said something like this:

What kind of a fool thing is this they have adopted? The tenant and sharecropper get it all now. They are given their part of the crop with no strings on it. The landowner has to pay taxes and cost of production, housing, implements, and repairs. It is not fair that he should give away what he gets for good land practices, which make more money for his workers.

Now, I want to call the attention of the Members of this House to these facts: I assume that the majority of the membership are already acquainted with them, but for fear they may not be, in order that they may be included in the RECORD, I wish to point out that the 1930 census shows that in the South alone there were a total of farm operators aggregating 3,223,816; that of this number the owners were 1,415,675; managers, 17,358; tenants, 1,790,783, of which number 776,278 were sharecroppers. As against 1,415,675 landowners in the South, according to the 1930 census, we therefore have 1,790,783 tenants and sharecroppers.

Under those circumstances, how can there be a man anywhere in the country, and especially from the South, who would stand up and say in the discharge of a legislative duty, that a bill which was intended, at public expense, to carry benefits in the nature of a subsidy to the farming classes of this country should contain absolutely no provision for tenants, of whom there are more than 1,700,000 in one section of the country, but should provide that all benefits payable in that section should be paid to the land-owning class of 1,400,000; and that the same rule should apply throughout the country as a whole?

Mr. COX. All of that 1,700,000 having been discriminated against in the administration of the law heretofore.

Mr. TARVER. My colleague is quite right in his statement. It is generally acknowledged, at least it is acknowledged in the section of the country where the Bankhead Act operated, that in the administration of the Bankhead Cotton Act the small farmers and the tenant farmers were in many cases unjustly discriminated against.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. TARVER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I was very much interested in this farm relief being spread out, and the little fellow getting help. I wonder how the gentleman would administer to the tenant farmer, and why did the gentleman, the other day, when we were trying to limit relief to not more than \$2,000 to any particular farmer, vote against that proposal?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman well knows, if he is referring to the motion to recommit, that the provision to limit the relief to \$2,000 to any particular farmer was included with another provision in the same motion, to prevent the use for commercial purposes of lands planted in soil-conserving crops, a provision which was generally recognized by the membership of this House as clearly unconstitutional, and which would have invalidated the entire bill, it was passed. That is my answer to that question.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am interested in how this could be administered to help the tenant farmer, the sharecropper.

Mr. TARVER. May I say to my colleague, in the manner that was provided in the House amendment which I proposed on Friday, and which was adopted; that is, that those administering this act should take into consideration the value of the labor of the tenant in carrying out soil-conservation programs, what labor will be done by the tenant, and the extent to which the income of the tenant might be diminished because of the taking of lands which he would otherwise have cultivated, and devoting those lands to the production of grasses, legumes, or other soil-conserving crops.

That was the amendment which was adopted by the House, and it will certainly be no more impractical in administration than the provisions of the bill with reference to the payment of benefits to the landowners.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The gentleman to whom I have referred as Cotton Ed is represented to be one of the largest plantation owners in his State. His interest in the matter, therefore, may be assumed to be the interest of the large landowner. I frankly say that I do not believe he represents the majority of the landowners of my section of this Nation, because I believe that the majority of those do not entertain such a narrow, selfish, heartless attitude toward the tenant population of our section as that manifested by the statement of Cotton Ed.

Cotton Ed is the man who sat on the Doxey bill all last summer after it had been passed by the House and refused even to allow its consideration. That was the bill which proposed to exempt three bales of cotton to each farmer under the Bankhead Act.

May I say also that Cotton Ed, according to the newspapers, last fall came down to the capital of my own State and made a speech discussing the agricultural situation, in the course of which he undertook to criticize severely the administration of the Bankhead Act because, he said, it had resulted in undue hardship to the small farmers. A great sympathizer with the small farmer, is Cotton Ed, when he makes speeches in the South; but when he issues statements to the newspapers in Washington he does not hesitate to say that the tenant and the sharecropper get all now, and the thing that Congress ought to do is to undertake to take care of the landowner. There is such a thing as playing both ends against the middle. I have known gentlemen to attempt it sometimes, without being perpetually successful. Sometimes a practice of this sort may survive in a successful manner for a number of years, but I say to you that the man who at home pretends to represent and have the interest of the small farmer at heart, but who, when he comes to Washington, adopts the view that only the landowners are to be considered, is holding with the hares and hunting with the hounds in a thoroughly unjustifiable way.

His statement has accomplished at least one thing: There has been sifted through this House the information coming from certain quarters that it was not necessary to amend this act so as to say anything should be done for the tenant or the sharecropper. Why? Why, because they said, "We are going to take care of the tenant and the sharecropper; that is unnecessary surplusage; you should not put anything of that sort in the bill. It will simply hamper us in its administration."

But this gentleman to whom I have referred, and who this article states is a very powerful influence, does not state that this amendment ought to be eliminated because it is intended, any way, to take care of the tenant and sharecropper in the bill. No. On the contrary he says, "Eliminate it because you ought not to do anything for the tenant and the sharecropper." If the conferees appointed on the part of the House agree to the elimination of this amendment and if the House should concur in the conference report, nothing could better prove that the views of the powerful gentleman on the question had been adopted, and that it had been officially

determined by this Congress that in the payment of this subsidy, because it is nothing else, to the farm population of the country more than a majority in my section of the country of those engaged in agriculture should be ignored. I have no objection to the bill as a subsidy. If it were 20 times the amount, it would still be only a fraction of what has been taken from the farmers and given to manufacturers by the tariff. But it was taken from all of them, and if you are going to help farmers, help them all.

I do not claim that in what I have said to you this afternoon I have perhaps been politic. I admit that it might have been more diplomatic if I had not placed in the Record the facts to which I have referred, but in my judgment this is an issue about which if anything is done it must be done in the open. The forces that are operating in this Congress to deprive the tenant farmer and sharecropper of any benefits under this bill are not operating in the open.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

It was only the anger of the gentleman who issued the statement on Saturday which caused him to expose his hand so completely and to frankly admit that so far as he was concerned there was no purpose to be of any benefit to the tenant and the sharecropper; that they do not deserve the attention of Congress.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MASSINGALE. The gentleman is familiar with the conditions of tenantry in the South, and knows about the percentage of people who are tenants and sharecroppers. I should like to get the gentleman's opinion, if he does not mind giving it, on the disastrous effects that would follow the elimination of this amendment in the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Why, my dear colleague, I believe that any farm program which is patently intended or claimed to be an agent to bring about the rehabilitation of agriculture in this country which ignores in one section of the country alone 1,700,000 tenants, while undertaking to help 1,400,000 landlords, is foredoomed to failure, and ought to fail. So far as I am concerned, I would not have voted for this bill if that amendment had not been included; and I shall not vote for any conference report which undertakes to eliminate it. If the tenant farmers and the sharecrop farmers have enough friends on the floor of this House, we will deny the right of Cotton Ed to misrepresent and ignore the rights of the tenant-farmer class of our people as he undertook to do by the heartless statement published in the papers on Saturday. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the arch high priest of payment of Government bills by lottery made a personal reference to me and then was not sufficiently courteous, although he had time to spare, to permit me to correct his statement, which I will proceed to do at this time. However, before doing so, I may add I have a very high regard for the institution of learning situated in my district, from which that gentleman graduated. On the other hand, I doubt very much whether the course of training in that splendid institution had any leaning toward advocating gambling or lotteries; however, it does, I am quite sure, train the young men along the line of courtesy. I do not think the gentleman from New Jersey took that course as an elective one, otherwise he would have yielded to me a few moments ago after having used my name.

Mr. BIERMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I refuse to yield. I am referring to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KENNEY], a graduate of Williams College. I do not believe he took the course in courtesy. If he had, he would have yielded to me for a correction of the statement he was then making. He said that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] seemed worried about a tax bill. He was absolutely in error about that. I have not the slightest worry about a possible tax

bill, as the Republican minority will have no hand in writing this tax bill. That is a matter in the lap of the Democratic majority, after they have received their instructions from downtown. So the worry is all on that side of the House. The only worry on our side is for the unfortunate taxpayers who will have to pay the bill of Democratic extravagance. That is the correction I wanted to make, if the gentleman from New Jersey had been courteous enough to yield to me. I will now proceed with the subject matter which I wish to discuss at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, we find in this agricultural bill a page devoted to an appropriation for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The total appropriation for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for 1936 is \$5,734,801. I have not an analysis of how that money is to be expended, but it is fair to assume that the appropriations asked for are based upon estimates which come from experts capable of saying how much the various branches of the Government need for such purposes during the ensuing year. I believe these departments intend to expend this money in an impartial manner. Five million dollars today, in view of Democratic expenditures, is just a drop in the bucket. It is of no consequence to them. And, nevertheless, I say that these estimates should be made up upon a fair, impartial, and nonpolitical basis.

During the month of September 1935 there was submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics a report dealing with the cotton-reduction program of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. This report, among other things, showed that although the price received for cotton during 1934 with the adjustment program was about 3.6 cents per pound higher than the estimated price that might have been received without the program, this difference was not enough to offset the smaller quantity of cotton available for sale; so that the estimated gross return from cotton and cottonseed were less with the program than they would have been without the program. A portion of said report, although conceded to be accurate, was deleted therefrom before publication on the basis of a memorandum submitted by an official of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration which contended that "the publication of this report will result in intensifying the criticism of the entire principle of the adjustment program."

Would not that be too bad? It would be just too bad to have any criticism intensified. So, of course, it was deleted.

When the report was issued in altered and revised form, it was accompanied by a press release stating that "Continued cotton-production adjustments are needed." This is absolutely contrary to the undeleted, unexpurgated edition of the report that came into their hands from their experts, a conclusion directly opposite to that to be drawn from the original report.

Mr. Chairman, such suppression of the true facts relating to the Agricultural Adjustment program and the publication of misleading information in regard thereto is contrary to the public interest and frustrates the effort of Congress to legislate independently and impartially with regard to the agricultural program, as has been previously done. This situation attracted the attention of the press, and I have here several most interesting items from the press. First, I have some clippings from the Wall Street Journal covering the ground to which I have just referred. Further, may I say, not on the authority of the man himself but having secured the information elsewhere, that at the press conference following the publication of the report to which I have referred, the man who had written and made that statement in the Wall Street Journal was given a first-class calling down by the Secretary of Agriculture. This information did not come to me from the gentleman himself.

What could be more embarrassing for a fair-minded newspaperman, supposed to place the facts before the reading public, than to have the head of that Department scold him in the presence of his newspaper colleagues? Nobody has ever denied that this report was deleted. Further than that, not only was an attempt made to scold this truthful reporter, but in addition to that, it was an effort to intimidate other reporters not to print things disagreeable or unsatisfactory to

the Secretary of Agriculture. That is a very good illustration of how this administration and the Department of Agriculture are treating free press.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I would prefer not to, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if his statement is based on hearsay evidence?

Mr. TREADWAY. No. It is based on corroborated evidence, or I would not submit it, and furthermore, nobody has ever denied the accuracy of the report to which I have made reference.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has made certain accusations.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just wanted to know if he had based his statement upon hearsay evidence or from evidence which he himself obtained?

Mr. TREADWAY. Permit me to continue, and then the gentleman may draw his own conclusion. I am not using hearsay evidence. I am using accurate accounts from various newspapers, which statements have not been denied or corrected; in fact, they are correct, because it is so admitted in the final report sent out by the Bureau of Economics.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was confining myself to what the gentleman said about the scolding by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is correct and every newspaperman who was in the room at the time will say so.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was simply trying to find out whether the gentleman was making a statement based on hearsay or on accurate evidence.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am basing it on accurate evidence and not from any statement by the gentleman whom the Secretary of Agriculture scolded, but from other gentlemen who were in the room.

I think this answers my colleague's inquiry.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am quite satisfied.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am endeavoring to make accurate statements here and not statements based upon hearsay.

Now, bear this in mind, Mr. Chairman. This report, to which I am referring and which ought to be in the hands of Congress if a fair report is to be submitted on this subject, was made in September last. It then reached the high officials of the Department of Agriculture and the first reference to it is this corrected, deleted story issued by the Department on the 5th of February. It took them some time to get the corrections made in the way they wanted to have the report finally reach the public.

Now, what I am finding fault with is that we are making large appropriations for investigation. We are supporting every branch that furnishes information to the general public, but still it has to have a partisan, Democratic tinge or it cannot get by.

This is a just and fair criticism. What does the Chicago Tribune say about this matter in an editorial of last week? I shall read directly from it:

By withholding from the public and distorting reports of official bureaus, prepared for the information and guidance of the public, President Roosevelt and Secretary Wallace have placed themselves in the same position as unscrupulous corporation officers who withhold and distort reports prepared by auditors for the information of stockholders.

A congressional committee should proceed at once to investigate this scandal in the Department of Agriculture. The public is entitled to have the full and unexpurgated reports of the Government experts. A committee might also look into the question as to whether the suppression of official reports constitutes misfeasance and whether impeachment is called for. In any case, give the bunk about farm relief an airing before passing any more crop-control laws.

This is a portion of the editorial in connection with this subject matter. Now, there is another angle to this matter and in this connection I want to read an extract from the current issue of the Nation:

The supposedly nonpartisan Bureau of Agricultural Economics was caught doctoring a supposedly scientific report on the cotton situation in order not to embarrass the administration's efforts to get the new A. A. A. bill through Congress. Credit for the disclosure belongs to John W. Hazard, of the Wall Street Journal's

Washington bureau, who, undaunted by a rebuke from Secretary Wallace for having stated 2 weeks ago that the report had been doctored, ferreted out a copy of the report as originally written and a copy of an A. A. A. memorandum objecting to sections of the report as inimical to continuance of the crop-reduction program. Comparison of these with the report finally made public showed that the objectionable passages had been deleted and comments in line with A. A. A. policy substituted for them.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that these facts absolutely nullify the advantages of this supposedly impartial type of report. I am not at all surprised about this. The Democratic administration is so obsessed with putting these blame-fool notions through that they will go the limit, even to doctoring their own reports or reports submitted by their own officials.

There is another angle to this same question. There has been a gentleman connected with this Bureau for 16 years. He was 6 years at the head of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and about the time this report came out he found it advantageous to resign, and a gentleman who is a college professor, of course—we expect these places to be filled with them—a college professor who had been in the hog end of the work of the Department of Agriculture—I do not know just what he was doing there, but, at any rate, that was his official position, having something to do with hogs—Democratic hogs, I guess—was appointed to this gentleman's place after his 16 years of expert assistance in the Department of Agriculture. You can draw your own conclusions.

I was quite interested to look over the report or the memorandum that the new chief gave to the Subcommittee on Appropriations. He simply filed with this subcommittee various items, handed to him, undoubtedly, because he is evidently quite an honest man, for he says, "I have been in the Bureau about 9 months and have not known very much about the working of it except in a general way up to this time." He is honest enough to admit he does not know anything about it, but he did take the place of a man who knew all about it, whom they wanted to get rid of.

Now, there are other newspaper comments just as adverse to this situation as the ones I have read. Here is a front-page story, under date of February 14, in the Baltimore Sun:

Report on cotton outlook altered. A. A. A. requested Agricultural Economic Bureau to make change. Aim reported not to embarrass work for new farm program.

In other words, the report as finally submitted had to have in it the line of argument the present Triple A officials wanted to have there. If that does not absolutely nullify the value of the report, tell me what would.

Now, the Baltimore Sun follows up this 2-column story with some details. Changing the Facts is the title of the editorial. It says:

CHANGING THE FACTS

There are in Washington several agencies that were established exclusively for the purpose of engaging in research and fact finding. Their activities are supposed to be, and as a rule are, entirely above politics. They serve no political party but only the public.

Recently, however, according to a despatch from Washington by Mr. Paul Ward, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, one of these nonpartisan agencies, "revised a report on the cotton situation at the A. A. A.'s request in order not to embarrass the administration's efforts to get its new farm program through Congress." One section of the original report indicated, on the basis of a special study, that "though the A. A. A. had succeeded in raising cotton prices by reducing production the farmers enjoyed no actual benefit", for their returns were less than they would have been had there been no reduction of output.

The revised report omitted this significant section. The Secretary of Agriculture, as Mr. Ward recalls, sought subsequently to deny that the original report had in any way been revised. He called upon the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for confirmation of his contention, and this was forthcoming. As a result, Mr. Wallace took to task those newspaper correspondents who had suggested in their despatches that something had been left out or changed in the final report. But now, 5 months later, a copy of the original report has been discovered, and this shows that the "embarrassing" section was deleted, while Mr. Ward goes on to state that this was done at the request of the A. A. A.

This matter is of great importance not only because it reveals that supposedly nonpartisan Government fact-finding agencies can be subverted to political ends but also because the original finding of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics would appear to undermine one of the administration's strongest arguments for its new farm program.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman has read extracts from several newspapers that are antiadministration.

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not know that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, yes, the gentleman does know it; and he says that this has not been denied. Does the gentleman know whether or not the Secretary or the members who made the report have ever been interrogated?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; by those members of the press who were present at the press conference, and I have read extracts of what actually happened. I am persona non grata with the Agricultural Administration, so I would not be invited to the press conference.

Mr. BANKHEAD. My complaint is that on the whole the statement made by the gentleman is not a fair accusation—

Mr. TREADWAY. It is absolutely fair, for it is accurate, and what is accurate is absolutely fair.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman state on his responsibility, upon information he knows is accurate, that any real inquiry has been made of the Secretary of Agriculture or the members of this board who filed the original report as to the reasons, if any change was made?

Mr. TREADWAY. The reason why the change was made is apparent on the face of it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the gentleman's conclusion.

Mr. TREADWAY. No; it is the conclusion of everyone else, that no longer can we depend upon impartial, nonpartisan information coming out of these Departments.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN].

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I was quite astonished to listen to a statement some time ago that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration had wastefully destroyed pork products. I thought that that accusation had been answered fully at least a year ago, but apparently it has not been answered to the satisfaction of some gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. In order not to take up the time of the Committee, I ask unanimous consent that at this point I be permitted to extend my remarks by including a letter which I received a year ago from Chester C. Davis answering somewhat in detail that accusation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1935.

HON. FRED BIERMANN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BIERMANN: This is to acknowledge your letter of February 5 relative to the disposal of the lightweight pigs purchased during the emergency pig- and sow-buying campaign in the early fall of 1933.

There have been a number of charges or accusations made, similar to the one which you mention, that packers dumped whole carcasses into streams or piled them up in places so as to menace public health. No specific instances of such irregular disposition, however, have come to the attention of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

Such rumors were prevalent a few months ago, particularly in some regions. Since that time, however, I had believed that these charges had been proved false and hoped that they were no longer being spread. But if such rumors are still in circulation, they should not be allowed to go by without further refutation.

For your information and in order that you may aid us in dispelling these erroneous statements, here are some high lights relative to the processing of the pigs and sows purchased during the campaign:

The emergency pig- and sow-buying program, as you know, was recommended by the corn-hog producers and was conducted through a period of about 5 weeks, beginning on August 23, 1933. By the close of the buying period in late September about 5,100,000 light pigs, 1,100,000 heavy pigs, and about 220,000 sows had been acquired. The heavy pigs, weighing between 80 and 100 pounds, and representing about one-third of the total live weight of all pigs bought, and the sows were processed for edible use; that is, they were converted into dry salt pork, which was later distributed to needy families by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. The heavy pigs and sows utilized in this manner yielded nearly 100,000,000 pounds, or approximately 3,200 carloads of pork.

The light pigs, those weighing 80 pounds or less, were not utilized for edible purposes, because of two reasons: (1) Their small carcasses could not be adequately and satisfactorily handled by the packing-house machinery involved in the initial processing operations, particularly the dehairing machines; and (2) the complete utilization of all pigs for edible purposes, irrespective of the higher costs involved, would have considerably delayed the program. Light pigs, therefore, were utilized for inedible products, that is, fertilizer tankage and grease, of which the inedible grease was the more valuable.

After the animals had been dispatched, the principal processing operation for producing inedible products from the whole pig carcasses was complete rendering in tanks. The grease, which rose to the top of the tank during the process, was then drained off, and the residue, called fertilizer tankage, either was dried and stored or disposed of immediately—either dried or pressed and undried as the circumstances of the processor under contract permitted. The average yield of inedible grease per light pig was about 3 to 5 pounds per animal, depending on the weight. The tankage yield, dry basis, was about 5 pounds per animal. As animal flesh is composed of a high percentage of water, the product yield on a dry basis is, of course, a small percentage of the total live weight.

All of the grease, amounting to about 21,000,000 pounds, was saved because of its value for technical uses. This grease was sold to the highest bidders during the latter part of 1933. In the case of the tank residue, only about one-fourth of the product was saved, because of the lack of storage facilities and the low value of the product. The rendering-tank residue, because of its hair content, could not be converted into digester tankage, the most valuable type used in hog feeding. Federal regulations require that digester tankage be free from hair. Regardless of the disposal of the tankage, however, the contract required that all carcasses be completely rendered in order that the maximum yield of grease should be obtained.

Depending upon the situation of the contracting processors, the tankage not dried and stored was given to farmers who came to the processing plant, or it was hauled away and dumped where such dumping was permissible, or burned, buried, or consumed at public incinerators.

All slaughtering and processing operations were carried out under the supervision of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture. This assured the Agricultural Adjustment Administration that the processing contract specifications would be carried out in full. At points where the Federal inspection services were not available, processors were not permitted to enter into contracts with the Secretary under the emergency program.

In a few cases it was ascertained that the processors, under pressure of heavy receipts of pigs, were failing to render adequately the carcasses, thus failing to obtain the average yield of grease. In these cases compensating deduction was made in the reimbursement to packers under the terms of the contract. Insofar as possible, objectional disposal methods were not used, and in all cases the pigs were dispatched and the carcasses were rendered before disposal of the residue.

I hope that I have answered your question fully and accurately and to your satisfaction. However, if you wish to obtain further information relative to the emergency pig- and sow-buying campaign, I shall be very glad to get it for you.

Sincerely,

CHESTER C. DAVIS, *Administrator.*

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, it is frequently the case that public servants of the Government are subject to criticism; and I think it fitting, when a public servant of many years shall have terminated his service in a highly satisfactory manner, that there should be some recognition of the fidelity of that servant.

On January 31, 1936, Dr. Hugh S. Cumming, because of the condition of his health and his need for rest, retired as Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. He had held this position since February 1920, or a period of 16 years, and had served as an officer of the Public Health Service for 42 years.

Dr. Cumming is my constituent, and I do not think that his retirement from this position which he has filled with signal ability for such a long period of time should be permitted to pass unnoticed. He is the fifth Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. Preceding him have been Dr. John M. Woodworth, who served from 1871 to 1879; Dr. John B. Hamilton, who served from 1879 to 1891; Dr. Walter Wyman, who served from 1891 to 1911; and Dr. Rupert Blue, who served from 1912 to 1920.

Dr. Cumming was born in Hampton, Va., on August 17, 1869. His literary education was obtained at Symmes Eaton Academy, Hampton, Va., and Baltimore City College. He received his medical training at the University of Virginia,

where he was graduated in 1893. He entered the Public Health as assistant surgeon in 1894. In 1899 he was promoted to the grade of passed assistant surgeon; in 1911 to surgeon; in 1918 to Assistant Surgeon General; and in February 1920 he was appointed as Surgeon General.

Dr. Cumming received a broad preliminary training which fitted him particularly for his service as Surgeon General. He was peculiarly qualified to deal with the medical aspects of the immigration question by service at Ellis Island, San Francisco, and in foreign countries. He was on field duty in the yellow-fever epidemic of 1900, and his work as quarantine officer at southern quarantine stations and later at San Francisco brought him into intimate touch with diseases of the Orient and Tropics against which the United States has always maintained strict quarantine. Later he was brought into actual contact in Japan with these diseases.

After a tour of duty in the Orient he began the study of the pollution of navigable streams and made an investigation of coastal waters along the Atlantic seaboard.

During the World War he was detailed to the Navy as adviser in sanitation, and later was sent to Europe in charge of Public Health Service activities relating to sanitation, returning troops, and the resumption of trade. He then served as president of the Interallied Sanitary Commission to Poland, and it was from this work that he was recalled to the United States to assume the position of Surgeon General in 1920.

Dr. Cumming is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons, the American College of Physicians, American Public Health Association, and the American Medical Association. He has represented the United States as head of the American delegation at the Pan American Sanitary Conference at Lima, Peru, Habana, Cuba, and Buenos Aires, Argentina, and was a member of the American delegation to the Immigration Conference in Rome; he was head of the American delegation at a meeting of the Office International d'Hygiene Publique, which proposed the new international sanitary treaty, and a member of the international meeting which proposed the Pan American sanitary code. He is a member of the permanent committee of the Office International d'Hygiene Publique, and is a member of the health committee of the League of Nations.

Surgeon General Cumming has received the decoration of commander of the Legion of Honor of France and the decoration of commander, Poland Restituta of Poland, and has been tendered the order Al Merito of Ecuador, the Order of Carlos Finley of Cuba, and El Sol of Peru. A special act of Congress authorized him to accept these decorations.

Among the important achievements that have been accomplished during the time Dr. Cumming has been Surgeon General of the Public Health Service the following may be mentioned:

First. Reorganization of the hospital work and expansion of hospital facilities of the service to meet the emergency of temporarily caring for ex-service men and women who were beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration—now Veterans' Bureau.

Second. Completion of the national quarantine system by securing transfer to Federal control of the last State-owned quarantine stations in operation, which were located at the port of New York and at several ports in the State of Texas.

Third. Establishment of a national leprosarium for the care of lepers in the United States.

Fourth. Successful control of outbreaks of bubonic plague at New Orleans, La.; Beaumont, Tex.; Galveston, Tex.; Pensacola, Fla.; and Los Angeles, Calif.

Fifth. Erection of new marine hospitals at Cleveland, Ohio; Detroit, Mich.; New Orleans, La.; San Francisco, Calif.; Baltimore, Md.; Stapleton, N. Y.; Seattle, Wash.; and Galveston, Tex.; and new quarantine stations at Mobile, Ala.; New Orleans, La.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Miami, Fla.; and Sabine, Tex.

Sixth. Inauguration of plan of assigning medical officers to American consulates abroad in connection with the medical examination of intending immigrants prior to departure for the United States.

Seventh. Development and expansion of important research and field investigative activities of the Public Health Service.

Eighth. Rationalization of maritime quarantine procedures, differentiating and lessening the restrictions applied in international intercourse with the United States, and resulting in conservation of time and costs due to these procedures.

Ninth. Supervision of sanitary control of international serial navigation provisionally established on a tolerant and understanding basis, pending the completion of studies inaugurated to determine scientifically the basis for any necessary quarantine restrictions, and participation in international conferences on the sanitary control of serial navigation.

President Roosevelt nominated Dr. Cummings for a fourth term as Surgeon General, which became effective March 10, 1932.

In addition to the duties directly connected with the Public Health Service, Dr. Cumming is a member of the Board of Hospitalization formed by the President for the purpose of making recommendations concerning the expenditure of funds for the purchase and erection of hospitals used by the Veterans' Bureau. He holds a designation from the President as a member of the board of visitors of St. Elizabeths Hospital (Government hospital for the insane), an institution for the reception of insane patients under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. Surgeon General Cumming was chairman of the section on public health organization of the White House conference on child health and protection. He is a former president of the Southern Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, and of the Association of Military Surgeons.

Surgeon General Cumming was three times elected director of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, dealing with sanitary problems common to the Pan-American countries. As Surgeon General, Dr. Cumming was the responsible administrative head of the Public Health Service, whose functions, under law, may be summarized as follows:

First. Protection of the United States from the introduction of disease from without, through the Federal maritime quarantine system.

Second. Prevention of the interstate spread of disease and suppression of epidemics.

Third. Cooperation with State and local health authorities in public health matters.

Fourth. Investigations of the diseases of man.

Fifth. Supervision and control of biologic products.

Sixth. Medical examination of prospective immigrants in foreign countries and of arriving aliens at ports of entry in the United States.

Seventh. Public health education and dissemination of health information.

Eighth. Medical care and treatment of certain beneficiaries authorized by law.

Ninth. Operation and maintenance of narcotic farms designed to rehabilitate and restore to health persons addicted to the use of narcotic drugs.

In all of these services and in performance of his duties, Dr. Cumming was always diligent, faithful, and efficient. He gave them his personal attention, and no matter was too small to receive his attention if the health of the Nation was involved.

I have known him since his early manhood and my admiration for him has grown with the passing years. Quiet and modest, he has never sought for personal glory, but has always tried, as a faithful public servant, to leave behind him a record of duty well done.

Hampton, where he was born, is proud of her native son, and Virginia feels that he has added new luster to her roll of distinguished men and faithful public servants. He holds, and will ever hold, the abiding affection of his native town and State. A warm welcome awaits him at home.

I am sure that I speak the sentiments of all who have known him here when I wish for him many years of health and happiness. [Applause.]

I desire to incorporate as a part of my remarks copies of letters from the President and from the Secretary of the Treasury on the occasion of Dr. Cumming's retirement, and commending his work.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington.

Surg. Gen. HUGH S. CUMMING,
United States Public Health Service.

MY DEAR DR. CUMMING: I have most regretfully given my approval to the finding of a board of medical officers convened at your request that you are no longer in fit physical condition to continue to bear the heavy burdens of your office as Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and their recommendation that you be placed on waiting orders effective February 1, 1936.

In thus acceding to your wish that you be placed on an inactive status to conserve your health, I can express only inadequately my admiration for the long career of distinguished public service that you have rendered. It has been a career of benefaction not merely to the Government and the people of the United States, but it has transcended the national boundaries, and you have deserved fame as a faithful and able servant of humanity that is world-wide.

I feel honored to have had the opportunity to work with you, and I desire to record my gratitude for your wise counsel and cooperation in more than 2 years of our association in public duty.

Sincerely yours,

H. MORGENTHAU, JR.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 28, 1936.

Surg. Gen. HUGH S. CUMMING,
United States Public Health Service.

MY DEAR DR. CUMMING: It was with great regret that I learned that the state of your health would no longer permit you to bear the heavy strain of your work as Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and that Secretary Morgenthau had therefore given approval to the findings of a medical board, convened at your request, which recommended that you be placed on waiting orders as of February 1.

Your release from active duty marks the rounding out of a career in the public service which the American people can view with pride and admiration because of the honor you have brought to them as their faithful servant and benefactor. You yourself may view it with the most thorough satisfaction in a task well done.

I am happy to recall that your labors in protecting humanity against disease and in advancing health standards everywhere have brought you deserved recognition and honor, not only in your own country but throughout the world.

I am privileged to express to you the gratitude of the Nation and to add my own thanks for the great service you have rendered.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I heartily join with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] in paying tribute to the very great service of Surgeon General Cumming during the many years he occupied that office. Under his direction, the Public Health Service has attained its present high efficiency and reputation. His many friends and associates, I am sure, wish him a long life of happiness.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WILCOX].

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Chairman, contrary to custom I desire to make a reference to the bill under consideration during general debate. My object in doing so is to serve notice that at the appropriate time when the bill is being read, I expect to offer an amendment. My purpose in rising at this time is to urge the committee at the time of the offering of my amendment not simply to vote it down, but to give it careful consideration.

The appropriation bill for the Weather Bureau is deficient in that it does not make sufficient appropriation for storm-warning service. This service is of particular interest to my district. Probably I ought not to refer to the fact that occasionally my district is visited by tropical hurricanes which originate in the Caribbean area. For a number of years we tried to deny the existence of those hurricanes, we tried to avoid any reference to them, but denying their existence did not stop the hurricane, when it decided to pay us a visit. In recent years a number of these tropical disturbances originating in the Caribbean area have stricken my district with a resultant property loss and loss of human life that none of us likes to think about. I think

I may say with all propriety that they do not originate in Florida and that they are therefore not Florida hurricanes. A hurricane is not dangerous provided sufficient warning is given of its approach to enable the people to take necessary precautionary measures. When adequate warning has been given there has been no loss of life and practically no loss of property. Precautionary measures can be taken which greatly minimize the danger of these disturbances, but in recent years, through lack of adequate facilities, the Weather Bureau has not been able to properly and efficiently forecast the path of these tropical disturbances, the most recent of which was brought home to us in a very unfortunate way with the enormous loss of life in the veterans' camp on the Florida Keys. It is no reflection on the Weather Bureau that that hurricane struck with the resulting loss of life.

The Bureau did the best it could with the inadequate facilities at hand. These disturbances originate in the Caribbean Sea. The Weather Bureau has to depend, in very large measure, upon ships in the area for accurate information. Naturally, the ships leave the area when these disturbances arise. So when the Labor Day hurricane of 1935 struck, the Weather Bureau was without sufficient, adequate information to plot the course of the storm. The result was that it was only a few hours before the hurricane actually struck that the Weather Bureau was able to warn people in that section, and it was too late for them to get out of the area and get to a place of safety. The result was that more than 500 people lost their lives.

Mr. Chairman, I expect, when this bill is read for amendment, to offer an amendment to the Weather Bureau portion of the bill. I want to appeal to the committee not to resist that amendment. I know, of course, the difficulty of amending an appropriation bill on the floor. I know that everybody who comes in from the cloak rooms and the lobbies like to support the committee because they have not had an opportunity to avail themselves of the information at hand. Naturally, they want to go along with the committee. I want to appeal to the House and to the Committee on Appropriations not to resist this amendment, because I have just been in telephonic communication with the Director of the Bureau and he tells me that this amendment is very vital and necessary. I expect to ask for an additional amount to be made available to the Weather Bureau for the purchase of additional instruments and the installation of additional facilities which will enable the Bureau to correctly and accurately plot the course of these storms, and distribute and disseminate accurate information in time for the people in the danger zone to avail themselves of it. I do not expect to ask for any large sum. I am told by Mr. Gregg, of the Bureau, that an additional \$25,000 will cover the cost of additional instruments and additional facilities. So, at the proper time, I am going to offer an amendment of that character. The purchase of instruments is only a part of a program which includes the construction of storm-proof houses of refuge, but that portion of the program is expected to be financed in another way, and all I am seeking at this time is the money to purchase necessary instruments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. TARVER. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BEAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILCOX. I yield.

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the enlightening statement which the gentleman has just made. For my own information and the information of the committee I should like to hear just what precautionary measures, in addition to those taken, the people of Florida would avail themselves of?

Mr. WILCOX. It will take more than the minute which has been allowed me to answer the gentleman's question. If I had sufficient time I would be glad to answer the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILCOX. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the chairman to yield the gentleman additional time so that I may ask him a question or two.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Florida 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WILCOX. The course of a hurricane is easily plotted if sufficient and accurate instruments are available. The barometric pressure, wind direction, and velocity may be ascertained, and the path of a hurricane may be accurately plotted many hours in advance of its actual approach. But these hurricanes originate in the Caribbean area and they come across the Bahama Islands, the Lesser Antilles, across the open water. There are at this time in that area no adequate facilities for taking the barometric readings, the wind direction, and pressure, and other readings necessary to an accurate plotting of the course of the hurricanes. It is proposed by the Weather Bureau to install adequate instruments in that area and along the Florida coast, which would give them sufficient information to accurately plot the course and direction which a hurricane is taking. I may say that these hurricanes have certain well-known characteristics. Those that originate at certain seasons of the year move northward through the Atlantic. Those that originate in certain other seasons move directly westward through the Yucatan Channel into the Gulf of Mexico. Those hurricanes strike the east coast of Texas and Mexico. Those that originate in the month of September usually proceed in a northeasterly direction and are apt to strike the east coast of Florida. If sufficient instruments are provided and sufficient facilities are made available the plotting of the course of a hurricane is a very easy and a very accurate matter. Once it is plotted, and sufficient warnings are given, the people may take the necessary precautionary measures, by means of boarding up their houses, and so on, and seeking places of safety so that there is no real danger of loss of life or of property.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILCOX. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think that someone was very remiss in not removing the veterans earlier? I have the report released in September of the W. P. A., and it seems to me clear, after reading this report, that there was some mismanagement resulting in great tragedy.

Mr. WILCOX. I would not want to get into that difficulty at this time. There is quite a conflict of opinion as to who, if anyone, was to blame. I should like to discuss that some other time, but I do not want to get that question involved here. Of course, we all have our own ideas as to who may or may not have been at fault, but I can say to the lady that I believe, if we had had accurate instruments and enough of them in enough places so that the course of the storm might have been accurately charted, sufficient information could have been given in advance of the approach of the storm, that the veterans could have been removed.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that when I offer this amendment it will not be voted down.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WILCOX. I am sorry, but my time has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the very illuminating and brilliant presentation by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Wilcox] of what might be done to avert the results of hurricanes in his region. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that there is another hurricane on the horizon, which we might call a political hurricane. That hurricane is the Townsend plan.

Opponents of the McGroarty bill are vehement in their asserting—first, that it will not accomplish its purpose; second, that a transaction tax will so pyramid as to increase

the price of commodities that a situation of wild inflation will result; and, third, that the idea is ridiculous; which, of course, is not argument at all but merely opinion, backed only by prejudice, and barren of facts in substantiation of the position.

It is my view that a 2-percent transaction tax will produce sufficient to pay every qualified person over 60 a pension of \$200 per month.

It is my opinion, based on careful research, that this would not be a calamity but a national blessing.

Why? Because it would put a vast volume of purchasing power into circulation, based on the theory of velocity of money, a theory held by a large body of reputable economists.

This vast volume of purchasing power would arise due to the fact that the money would be spent in the 30-day period.

This would increase demand for consumer goods. This demand for consumer goods would at once call for increased production. This increased production would call for increased manpower to meet the demand; thus, our unemployment problem would be solved and prosperity, such as we cannot even envision, would result.

There would be some increase in prices, but there was a vast increase during the war due to the war demand—at that time it was 37 percent—and most of the goods went abroad—and everyone was prosperous. No one, I am sure, has the hardihood to maintain that we are today able to consume all that we produce. Give us the McGroarty bill, and that happy situation will be brought about.

This would create an increased demand for goods produced and consumed at home.

It would not transfer purchasing power from one group to another, as is charged, because the demand would at once, through higher wages, increase the purchasing power of both producer and consumer.

Eighty-seven and one-half percent of all the purchasing power of money in this country comes from pay checks. The pay check consumes 87½ percent of all the goods and services produced in the United States. If you increase the number of people drawing pay checks, by reason of this increased labor you will increase the wages of labor and the purchasing power of labor; and, Mr. Chairman, increase of purchasing power has been the one thing this Congress has done its best to bring about. Here is a plan simple in conception and nothing like as intricate in execution as most of its opponents claim. It would actually increase the consuming power of a vast number of the people of the country. By reason of their increased purchasing power there would be a tremendous demand for consumer goods. This tremendous demand for consumer goods would call for the rehabilitation of many of the factories that now lie idle. It would bring into operation that well-known law of the velocity of money; and, in my reasoned judgment, it would bring about prosperity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CASTELLOW].

Mr. CASTELLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to contract the same if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Mr. Chairman, I had no idea of being able to secure time this afternoon to address the House upon any subject whatever until just a little while ago. It had been my hope to have secured some time during general debate on the agricultural conservation bill.

I was struck especially with the remark made by my most esteemed and highly appreciated colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] on that occasion. It did not seem that he was entirely satisfied with all of the provisions of the bill, and on that I certainly have no quarrel with him. One of the suggestions he made in regard to the situation was that it did not yet appear what answer would be given to the oft-repeated question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], "Where are you going to get the money?" There is but one place from which money can be secured by the

Government, and that is from its citizens, and from that class of its citizens who produce money. Money is not produced except by those who labor. The men who produce money, as a rule, are not in the millionaire class, but are those who earn their living by the sweat of their brow. Most of the money which we have, and which we are appropriating, has or will come from the toiler; and who has a better claim to that expression of identification than the farmer? Since he, in the last analysis, must provide most of the revenue for the Government, he should certainly be entitled to some consideration in its distribution.

The question of taxes which has not yet, it occurs to me, been seriously considered, will finally be of utmost importance. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the House to the remarks which I made in January 1934 upon this subject. At that time I said that I found in this legislative body one committee to deal with the expenditure of money and a separate and distinct committee to provide the revenue out of which the appropriations are made. At that time I compared it to the situation of the head of a family who is called upon to produce the money to meet the family budget without having any say-so as to how it should be spent. As I recall, I stated on that occasion that I felt the old man who toiled to earn the wherewithal should at least be consulted at times about its distribution and expenditure. I went so far as to suggest that the Committee on Ways and Means should act first, should see how much money could be raised, from what sources it could be supplied, and that after we had accumulated the money we should consider its expenditure. I stated it was my observation that the successful man in the conduct of his business or his home was the man who provided the money before he even permitted his good wife to go shopping and who acquainted her with the amount he had. Then she could more wisely make her choice of purchases. As it is good for an individual, so I believe it would also be good for a government. Not only that, there is a psychological effect.

Throughout all time taxes have been unpopular and government officials desiring to retain individual popularity developed the policy of imposing taxes in such a way as not to invite too much criticism or opposition from the people who had to pay them. Consequently they often resorted to indirect taxes, and this is the one thing that will destroy financially a man or a nation quicker than any other—concealing the thing which kills. Strychnine is one of the bitterest of all drugs, but administered in capsules its taste is concealed. Its destructive effect, however, is just as sure.

Taxes may be concealed from the people upon whose backs they are placed, but the weight is there just the same, and bears down accordingly.

I have even gone to the extent of saying I doubt the advisability of permitting a government to issue any bonds whatsoever. They should run on a cash basis. They should collect the taxes as they go along. If they will do that, there will always be sound government and not so much complaint about reckless expenditures. There is a psychological effect to that also. If you do not agree, just try it. We should cease buying on credit. As I have stated before, there are two words which I believe are responsible for more bankruptcies than all others combined, and those two words are "charge it."

If every man were required to pay in cash his proportionate part of governmental expenditures as made, and not be permitted to make payment even by check but, rather, count it out in new silver dollars, governmental extravagance could not exist. Adopt this policy, if you will, in your private affairs and note the result. Pay over the counter in new silver dollars! You will see what difference it makes in the budget that must be provided.

Mr. Chairman, this is not all I had in mind to say about this bill. I made some remarks in this House on the 6th day of February in reference to regimentation. I believe there is not a man in America, whether he be from the North, West, East, or South, who is more opposed to being regimented, supervised, and controlled than I am. You may not

readily recall my remarks on that subject, but if you do and have noted my vote on the agricultural bill it might occur to you there is some inconsistency. However, I insist that my conclusion in each instance is not only reasonable but logical. The agricultural bill, as before stated, contains certain objectionable features. It makes of the Secretary of Agriculture a court of last resort. For this year and next it gives him a broad discretion in distributing \$500,000,000 annually among the farmers of the Nation, in accordance with regulations to be formulated. Thereafter, and as a permanent policy, payments or grants will be made from the Federal Treasury to the farmers of each State in accordance with laws or plans formulated and submitted by the respective States or organizations therein, provided such laws or regulations are approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. In other words, the Department will not formulate these plans—that will be left to the States or subdivisions thereof—but before any State may draw anything from the Treasury of the United States the plan must be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Secretary cannot compel anyone to come into this program. No one can be forced into this program under the bill. However, by way of illustration, suppose an aggregation of 48 men were called upon to provide a fund for a banquet. The table is spread most abundantly with food. The master of ceremony announces, "Now, here we have the food. You see it. I cannot compel a single one of you 48 men to come in and sit at this board or partake of these refreshments. You may come or not, as you like; there is nothing compulsory. Although there is no other source of supply and you have contributed your proportionate share to this splendid spread, you cannot partake thereof without my approval. If I do not like the set of your hat or the cut of your pants, you will have to step out. You must submit yourself for my approval before you can enter. It is up to you, not to me, as to whether you come in; but, if you do not, you may remain out and perish to death, you darned old fool."

There you are. That is the plan. There is no compulsion; none whatsoever.

Just a few minutes ago I remarked to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], when someone on the other side was talking: "I thought when I came here that we were in such a great majority the Democrats had the advantage of the Republicans. But I find, as usual, the Republicans seemingly have it their own way. They have three times as much time per capita to talk as have the Democrats. That is pretty good management for the Republicans, it seems to me."

To this my good friend [Mr. TARVER] replied, "You must take into consideration this fact: I was in the House when the situation was reversed, and we had three times as much time per capita, which shows that it is not satisfactory to try to fix things just for today. You have to think about tomorrow." Then I asked my good friend: "What about the bill we passed last week?" What of the agricultural program we have been administering under a Democratic regime? The Secretary of Agriculture is the arbiter of this entire program, and yet it would seem, from certain remarks heretofore made upon the floor, that at least it has not been conducted in conformity with the wishes and to the liking of some of the most pronounced Democrats in the House.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], staunchest of the Democrats and a consistent supporter of the administration, declared on the floor of the House on January 8:

I do not approve of many things that Henry Wallace has done. He has filled my district with Republicans from Iowa and from all over the West. He has an army of them down there.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Mr. Chairman, that statement, as I said, came from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], the Democrat of Democrats. It will be recalled what he said about the situation in his district, and this with a northern Democrat administering the act. What will happen, I ask my friends in the South, when a northern Republican is tell-

ing the men of the South who produce the cotton what they must do before they may seat themselves at this banquet board? I can hear now the cry coming from the far-away Dixieland asking the men who are in Congress then, "Where were the Democrats, especially from Georgia, when this bill was put over in the House?"

Think of the situation! It is all right today, possibly, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BLANTON, states, or I would infer from his remarks that it is even all right now; but how will it be then? Look and see what the situation really is and do not legislate only for today, but think of tomorrow, next year, and throughout the time to come. This is the danger in this kind of legislation. We call it emergency legislation, but when the emergency has passed and another body sits in the seat of the mighty, and they enact certain laws, provide rules and regulations that are not satisfactory to us, then they will point to us and say, "If we are wrong, you pointed the way", and what will be our answer?

My justification in supporting the legislation may be understood from the following illustration: In going through a penitentiary you may find one of the inmates eating, and you may say, "My friend, do you like to be in the penitentiary?" The man would most probably reply, "No; I regret it and detest above all things being in the penitentiary." Then you would say, "Why, then, are you eating? A sure way to get out would be to quit eating, would it not?" The answer is apparent. Although in the penitentiary, why refuse nourishment?

I am speaking seriously. We in the South, as I see it, by much of our legislation, are putting ourselves in just that situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to discuss a subject that has been talked about on this floor quite a good deal, but seeing the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] here, I will not have time to take that detour. I always listen to what the gentleman from New York has to say. The gentleman compared the things we have been doing to a balloon that you pressed on this side and it bulged out on the other, or you pressed it at the bottom and it bulged out on top, and so forth. Long before I heard the gentleman speak I had been thinking somewhat along the same line, and here is the way I illustrated the situation. God Almighty has put us flat-footed on the ground, and as long as we so remain we are reasonably safe from tripping. But when ambition prompts one to seek an artificial height by the use of stilts, although only 6 inches in height, he arouses in another a similar ambition to surpass him. Forthwith, he provides himself with 12-inch stilts. Another, unwilling to be outdone, makes his 2 feet in height, and so on until 6 feet or more might be the artificial elevation. The higher they are made, however, the more uncertain is the balance and sooner or later a limit is reached, and one and all topple and tumble to the ground.

In order to protect industry and provide for it superior advantage a high protective tariff was levied. This made it imperative that a similar advantage be given to farming and other industries. We have undertaken, it seems, to raise every enterprise to artificial levels. If everything is placed upon a level, what advantage is there to any even at a dizzy height, for a level is a level after all, and the closer to the ground the more secure. In a recent discourse by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], he was asked this question by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], "Did not the distortion of the economic balloon begin with pushing in the thumb of high-protective tariffs for special privilege?" To this Mr. WADSWORTH answered, "It did." Since I have been in Congress I have heard thousands of questions and answers, but I do not recall I ever heard a single answer of yes or no except on this occasion. [Applause.]

I also believe this all began with your tariff, and now with everybody on stilts, what can the poor farmer do except to

get on stilts himself, even though he knows he is liable to break his neck; but I trust to goodness he does not. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the afternoon, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] was giving some comprehensive statements relative to the finances of the country. He was deploring the fact that in some years the percentage of the rate of high income taxes was reduced. He said that if they had kept them up we would have paid the national debt. At that time I asked him a question, and I said if my memory served me correctly that after the reduction of income rate in the 1924 tax bill we received more income for the Government from income taxes than the year before. He said I was entirely mistaken. I did not proceed much further but I told him that if my memory served me, I was correct.

Since then I have looked up the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for October 31, 1927, and I will read from that report:

The Revenue Act of 1926 eliminated about 2,000,000 individual taxpayers; it increased by 50 percent and 40 percent, respectively, the exemptions for single and for married persons; it cut the normal rates drastically and reduced maximum surtax rates from 40 percent to 20 percent; it doubled the limit of income to which this earned-income provision applied. It was very naturally anticipated that these changes would result in a considerable off of revenue.

In its report the Ways and Means Committee estimated a reduction of \$46,000,000 in normal tax, over \$98,000,000 in tax returns from the surtax, and a further loss in revenue of \$42,000,000 due to increased exemptions. As a matter of fact, however, the individual filed for the calendar year 1925 showed a larger tax return than did those for 1924, the total (net income) tax returned increasing from \$704,000,000 to \$734,000,000. The Treasury Department had always contended that lower rates would be more productive than the very high rates which prevailed, but neither the Treasury Department nor the Congress had anticipated such an immediate increase, an increase which was, of course, greatly accelerated by the rising tide of prosperity.

Mr. KELLER. From what is the gentleman reading?

Mr. SNELL. I am reading from pages 2 and 3 from the Revenue Division in hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, October 31, 1927, the report of the Treasury which will substantiate my statement.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM].

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, on February 6 I addressed the House. I stated that at a later date I intended to submit to the House evidence to warrant the charge that Walter Hines Page, United States Ambassador to the Court of St. James during the last war, conducted himself traitorously in that important office.

This I now propose to do.

On August 11, 1914, President Wilson issued a proclamation of neutrality. In it were these sentences:

We must be impartial in thought as well as in action; we must put a curb on our sentiments as well as upon every transaction that might be construed as a preference of one party to the struggle before another. . . . Every man who really loves America will act and speak in the true spirit of neutrality, which is the spirit of impartiality and fairness and friendliness to all concerned.

This neutrality proclamation bound all Americans to be neutral. It bound all Americans who loved America to be impartial. It enjoined upon all American officials particularly, if they were to be loyal to the United States and to the President who had appointed them, to be impartial in thought as well as in action.

Walter Hines Page occupied the most exalted post in the diplomatic service of the United States. He was United States Ambassador to the Court of St. James.

Great Britain was then a belligerent. The United States was neutral.

It was the official, if not the sacred duty, of Ambassador Page to help the State Department to hold Great Britain to international law, and thereby protect the rights of

Americans. Instead of doing that, he threw all his strength upon the side of Great Britain, as the record will show.

In the Intimate Papers of Colonel House, by Charles Seymour, Sterling professor of history, Yale University, volume I, page 310, Mr. Seymour, in referring to the seizure of American vessels as early in the war as November 1914, only 3 months after war had been declared, has the following to say:

Unfortunately, the oil and the copper exporters in the United States felt differently, and protests poured in upon the State Department in Washington. For Mr. Page, who was in vital sympathy with the allied cause, the situation was worse than trying. His nerves became taut. As usual, the minor questions were the more vexatious. What was dangerous was that, in his misunderstanding and irritation with the State Department, he should lose sight of the Washington point of view, which he was sent to London to represent.

On page 312 of the same volume there is printed the following letter from Colonel House to Ambassador Page:

NEW YORK, December 4, 1914.

DEAR PAGE: I have just returned from Washington. . . .

The President wishes me to ask you please to be careful not to express any unneutral feeling, either by word of mouth or by letter, and not even to the State Department. He said that both Mr. Bryan and Mr. Lansing had remarked upon your leaning in that direction, and he thought it would materially lessen your influence.

He feels very strongly about this, and I am sending the same message to Gerard.

Faithfully yours,

E. M. HOUSE.

In a book entitled "The Life and Letters of Walter H. Page", by Burton J. Hendrick, volume I, page 394, there is reported the following conversation between Ambassador Page and British Foreign Secretary Grey early in 1915, concerning the *Dacia*, a ship owned by an American, loaded with American cotton, and carrying an American crew and the American flag. Mr. Hendrick writes:

When matters had reached this pass, Page one day dropped into the Foreign Office.

"Have you ever heard of the British Fleet, Sir Edward?" he asked.

Grey admitted that he had, although the question obviously puzzled him.

"Yes", Page went on musingly. "We've all heard of the British Fleet. Perhaps we have heard too much about it. Don't you think its had too much advertising?"

The Foreign Secretary looked at Page with an expression that implied a lack of confidence in his sanity.

"But have you ever heard of the French Fleet?" the American went on. "France has a fleet, too, I believe."

Sir Edward granted that.

"Don't you think that the French Fleet ought to have a little advertising?"

"What on earth are you talking about?"

"Well", said Page, "there's the *Dacia*. Why not let the French Fleet seize it and get some advertising?"

A gleam of understanding immediately shot across Grey's face. The old familiar twinkle came into his eye.

"Yes", he said; "why not let the Belgian royal yacht seize it?"

The *Dacia* was seized by a French cruiser in the English Channel, as Ambassador Page had suggested.

This detailed conversation shows Page, American Ambassador, conspiring with the British Government to which he was accredited to bring about the seizure of an American vessel by a foreign belligerent government. I submit that this conduct was wholly traitorous to the American people and wholly disloyal to the President of the United States, whose representative he was and who had issued a proclamation of neutrality. As the record shows, his one aim was to help Great Britain, regardless of the rights of American citizens and the proclaimed neutrality of the United States.

In the Intimate Papers of Colonel House, volume I, page 445, in relation to the suggestion of President Wilson early in 1915 that Great Britain lift the embargo upon food, we find that Colonel House wrote the following:

Page was inclined not to make a personal appeal to Grey in behalf of the acceptance of the President's proposal concerning a compromise with Germany on the question of the embargo. I called his attention to the President's cable to me requesting me to say to Page that he desired the matter presented with all the emphasis in his power. He then said he would make an appointment with Grey and do so, though one could see he had no stomach for it. He did not consider the suggestion a wise one, nor

did he consider its acceptance favorable to the British Government. I argued to the contrary, and tried to convince him that the good opinion gained from the neutrals would be compensation enough for any concessions this (the British Government) might make, and that the concessions were not really more than those made by Germany.

This, mark well, was in 1915, 2 years before the United States entered the war.

On the next page, page 446, there appears a letter from Colonel House to the President. This letter is dated at London, May 20, 1915, and is as follows:

DEAR GOVERNOR: When your cable of the 16th came, I asked Page to make an engagement with Grey in order that we might protest against the holding up of cargoes and find definitely whether England would agree to lift the embargo on foodstuffs, providing Germany would discontinue her submarine policy. Page promised to make the appointment. He did not do so, and finally told me that he had concluded it was useless because, in his opinion, the British Government would not consider for a moment the proposal to lift the embargo.

According to this letter from Colonel House to President Wilson, Ambassador Page refused to obey an order from the President and was working in the interest of Great Britain. Here we have an example of insubordination as well as traitorous conduct and disloyalty to the President.

On page 456 of the same volume, the author writes:

* * * Colonel House was anxious that President Wilson should comprehend the difficulties which Sir Edward Grey faced, how hard he was pressed by British opinion and the Admiralty, and how important it was that the United States remain on friendly terms with the Allies. Whatever the irritation caused by the restriction of American trade, House never wavered in his conviction that our welfare was bound up in German defeat. All this Ambassador Page had urged in many long letters. But the very number and length of the letters, touched as they were by pro-Ally emotion, lessened the influence of the Ambassador who, in Washington, seemed more like the spokesman of Allied interests than the representative of the American Government.

In the Memoirs of Lord Grey, British Foreign Secretary during the war, volume II, page 110, we read:

* * * In all this Page's advice and suggestion were of the greatest value in warning us when to be careful or encouraging us when we could safely be firm.

One incident in particular remains in my memory. Page came to see me at the Foreign Office one day and produced a long despatch from Washington contesting our claim to act as we were doing in stopping contraband going to neutral ports. "I am instructed", he said, "to read this despatch to you." He read, and I listened. He then said: "I have now read the despatch, but I do not agree with it; let us consider how it should be answered!"

Here we see Mr. Page, American Ambassador, grossly violating his allegiance to the United States. Again we have an evidence of his disloyalty to the President of the United States, whose representative he was. Here we see the Ambassador of the United States collaborating with the British Foreign Office in drafting a reply to a protest from the United States Government. We see him acting as a British agent.

In the Life and Letters of Walter H. Page, by Hendrick, volume II, page 23, we read:

* * * He (the President) would sometimes refer to him (Mr. Page) as a man who was "more British than the British", as one who had been taken completely captive by British blandishments, but he never came to the point of dismissing him. Perhaps he did not care to face the public scandal that such an act would have caused. * * *

In nearly all his communications to the State Department and to the President, Mr. Page spoke as a partisan of Great Britain.

As recently as January 17 last, Senator GLASS, who served in the Wilson Cabinet as Secretary of the Treasury, in a speech in the United States Senate, made the following statement:

* * * As a matter of fact, everybody intimate with Mr. Wilson knows that he was excessively impatient with Ambassador Page because of the Ambassador's frequent and incessant partiality for Great Britain. And when an extract is read here from some letter from Ambassador Page in confirmation of the miserable charge that Woodrow Wilson is a liar, I begin to wonder if that was one of the letters from Ambassador Page which Wilson did not read at all. * * *

This statement may be found on page 573 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 17, 1936. Senator GLASS is

recognized as a man of high courage and of impeccable intellectual integrity.

In the Intimate Papers of Colonel House, volume II, pages 268-269, referring to the situation in the spring of 1916, Mr. Seymour, the author, writes:

At London Mr. Page was on the most intimate terms with Sir Edward Grey and through him could reach the other members of the cabinet. Unfortunately, as the Ambassador's letters indicate, he himself did not sympathize with Wilson's policy. While he did not advocate entering the war as a belligerent, he insisted that diplomatic relations with Germany should be broken, so as to indicate plainly that our sympathy lay with the Allies. Feeling thus and with intensity, himself inclined to regard Wilson as pursuing the wrong course both in remaining friendly with Germany and in bothering the Allies about trade questions, he found it difficult to explain the President's policy to the British. Wilson had long supported Page against those who insisted that the Ambassador took the British rather than the American view of the war, but his patience began to ebb. On May 17, 1916, he wrote House that the Secretary of State was so dissatisfied with Page's whole conduct of American dealings with the Foreign Office that he wanted to bring him back for a vacation, "to get some American atmosphere into him again."

Then there follows a letter from Colonel House to the President, dated at New York, May 18, 1916. It reads:

DEAR GOVERNOR: I do not think we need worry about Page. If he comes home at once, I believe we can straighten him out. You will remember I have urged his coming for more than a year.

I do not believe he is of any service there at present, and the staff are able to carry on the work. They have just added Hugh Gibson from Brussels, who is a good man. * * *

No one who has not lived in the atmosphere that has surrounded Page for 3 years can have an idea of its subtle influence; therefore he is not to be blamed as much as one would think. * * *

He would have done admirably in times of peace, but his mind has become warped by the war.

He may wish to remain after he comes home, for private reasons; and if he does, I would not dissuade him. On the other hand, if he remains here for the ordinary 60 days' leave, he will probably recover his equilibrium and there will be no further trouble with him. * * *

Affectionately yours,

E. M. HOUSE.

Ambassador Page was then recalled to the United States on leave. Mr. Page was recalled to the United States because the President deemed him "more British than the British" and in need of being purged of his unpatriotic character. However, this proved an impossible accomplishment, as may be seen by the following:

In the intimate papers of Colonel House, volume II, pages 318-319, in an excerpt from the diary of Colonel House, we read:

September 25, 1916: Walter Page called this afternoon (he wrote) and we had a 2-hour conference. I cannot see that his frame of mind has altered. He is as pro-British as ever and cannot see the American point of view. He hit Lansing wherever he could, but expressed profound regard for the President—a feeling I am afraid he exaggerates. * * *

On the following page, page 320, we read:

X (of the State Department) expressed much concern over our strained relations with Great Britain, which are growing worse rather than better. He attributes it to the two Ambassadors, Page and Spring-Rice. Of the two, Spring-Rice is more to blame, because Page is persona grata in London and creates no irritation, since he wholly agrees with the British point of view.

In the Life and Letters of Walter H. Page, by Hendrick, volume II, page 11, in discussing the selection of the successor of Mr. Bryan, who had resigned as Secretary of State, Mr. Hendrick indicates that the appointment of Mr. Page as Secretary of State was being pressed upon the President by Colonel House. Mr. Hendrick then states:

* * * But President Wilson believed that the appointment of an Ambassador at one of the belligerent capitals, especially of an Ambassador whose sympathies for the Allies were so pronounced as were Page's, would have been an "unneutral" act, and, therefore, Colonel House's recommendation was not approved.

In the recently published War Memoirs of Robert Lansing, Mr. Lansing, in referring to his own appointment as Secretary of State in June of 1915, pages 15-16, makes the following statements:

* * * He (the President) undoubtedly considered, among other names, those of Secretary McAdoo and the Honorable Walter Hines Page, the American Ambassador to London. Possibly the latter, whose appointment was, as I have been informed, strongly urged by Col. E. M. House, the President's most influential adviser,

would have received more favorable consideration under other conditions. . . . However, Mr. Page's prejudice in favor of Great Britain had embarrassed the administration and caused Mr. Wilson many anxious hours. In view of the President's fixed determination to preserve a strict neutrality, he hesitated to give consideration to Mr. Page's name. It was the Ambassador's lack, or apparent lack, of conformity with the President's policy of preserving a neutral attitude toward all the belligerents that was the obstacle which stood between him and the vacant secretaryship; and this objection even the powerful support of Colonel House, whose personal influence with Mr. Wilson was at the time very great, could not remove, though I believe that the President, on account of his friendship for Mr. Page, would have been glad in other circumstances to have named him as Mr. Bryan's successor.

Ambassador Page was disloyal to the American people. He was not loyal even to President Wilson, and was not in sympathy with the policies of Mr. Wilson, as the record clearly reveals.

In *The Life and Letters of Walter H. Page*, volume III, page 279, there appears a memorandum which Mr. Page wrote about the visit of Colonel House to London in January 1916. This memorandum contains the following:

The President today sends House a telegram to the effect that the German submarine controversy being laid, all the pressure of criticism will be made on Great Britain—a certain fierce, blue-bellied Presbyterian tone in it.

On page 290 of the same volume, in discussing the so-called House memorandum of 1916, containing a proposal to end the war, which was approved by President Wilson, the author makes the following statement:

The unfortunate fact is that Page had no longer any confidence in President Wilson.

It has been publicly stated that Ambassador Page consented to a British request for permission to intercept and search the baggage of all American diplomatic officials below the rank of minister who happened to be taken by the British while traveling to and from their posts in Europe.

This most shameful violation of international law and diplomatic usage said to have been approved by Ambassador Page is another instance of the traitorous conduct of Mr. Page to the American people and of his disloyalty to the President of the United States in favor of British interests.

As has been said by others, in all this Mr. Page's conduct cannot be excused, as some have tried to excuse it, on the ground that he meant well and had uppermost in his mind only the promotion of a great cause—Anglo-American unity. That was likewise the obsession of Benedict Arnold in the later days of the American Revolution, and he worked for it in a more direct and courageous fashion.

In the *Life and Letters of Walter H. Page*, volume II, page 237, there appear quotations from a memorandum written by Mr. Page in 1917 after the United States had declared war. Mr. Page in this memorandum relates an intimate conversation with King George on the occasion of a visit to Windsor at the invitation of the King. In this connection, Mr. Page writes:

. . . After I had risen and said "good-bye" and was about to bow myself out the door, he (the King) ran toward me and waving his hand cried out, "Ah, ah; we knew where you stood all the time."

A memorial to Walter Hines Page has been erected at Westminster Abbey, a fitting place. Westminster Abbey is the shrine of British national heroes. We do not find there any memorial to George Washington, to Thomas Jefferson, to Andrew Jackson, to Grover Cleveland, or even to Woodrow Wilson.

I submit that the foregoing documentary evidence from the lips of Ambassador Page himself, from President Wilson, Colonel House, and other men with whom he was closely associated, fully proves that Ambassador Page was faithless to his trust and disloyal to his President. There is no escape from that record. There can be no palliation.

The moving finger writes; and, having writ
Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

It will forever remain unknown exactly what influence Ambassador Page had in involving the United States in the last war. It is clear, however, that from the very beginning

of the war Mr. Page was the agent of the British Foreign Office and was working in the interest of Great Britain; also, that President Wilson finally adopted the viewpoint of Mr. Page.

On February 6, last, I submitted to the House an excerpt from the private diary of Col. Edward M. House, dated September 28, 1914, in which it was disclosed that although he had no official status, he obtained a note written by the Secretary of State destined to the British Government, protesting against the seizure by the British Government of American shipping, and that he took it to the British Ambassador here at Washington and allowed the British Ambassador to rewrite this note of protest to his Government.

There is ample evidence that the British Foreign Office dominates the foreign policy of the present administration. Let us not wait until 20 years after, and until the "Memoirs", the "Intimate Papers", and the "Confessions" of our present pro-British officials are compiled and published. Let us have the disclosures now. I renew my suggestion that this Congress should institute an inquiry of the most searching character into the present domination of our State Department by the British Foreign Office.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LAMBETH].

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Chairman, I am undertaking to do what is perhaps a presumptuous thing, and that is to reply to an address just delivered which had been prepared in advance and read to the House. I waited the entire day, as I have waited every day for the past 2 weeks, for that address. Perhaps the best description that I can give of it is to quote to you from one of Aesop's Fables:

The mountain was in labor, sending forth dreadful groans, and there was highest expectation throughout the region, but it brought forth only a mouse.

The gentleman who just preceded me has read a lot of books, and he quoted here most of the time during his remarks from the works of Hendrick on the *Life and Letters of Walter Hines Page*, from Seymour's *Intimate Letters of Colonel House*, and from the *Autobiography of Viscount Grey, 25 Years, 1892-1916*. Those books were published in the following years: The book on Colonel House in 1926, Viscount Grey's *Autobiography* in 1925, *Life and Letters of Walter Hines Page* in 1923. Ten years have elapsed since all the information which the gentleman from Massachusetts has brought to the House was published. It is very interesting to note that the gentleman relied chiefly upon the papers of Colonel House to prove that Ambassador Page was "guilty of traitorous conduct", when he had already denounced Colonel House as being "the son of an expatriated Englishman."

I shall quote from that great authority, than which there is none greater nor more authentic, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD!

On January 17, 1918 (65th Congress, 2nd sess., Vol. 56, pt. 1, p. 976), the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] delivered an address, and I take my text for the remarks which I shall submit in reply to the address that he just delivered the following words: "America wants the truth, and it is vital that America have the truth." Those words were spoken by that great truth teller, the gentleman from Massachusetts, and none other. He had just then returned from a visit to Europe, and I quote further from that address, because it is a very interesting one:

Autocracy in Europe has democracy by the throat and is strangling it. . . . It seems impossible for France and England to obtain a military decision, and France and England frankly admit the absolute necessity of a colossal effort on the part of America. . . . The best informed men in France and in England believe a decisive military decision cannot be reached before 1919 or 1920, when America will be able to contribute her real military strength. . . . This war, cost what it may, in blood or treasure, strength and sacrifice, must be won for America's honor and America's future.

Thanks to an efficient administration, headed by our great war President, our able Secretary of War who still lives, and our distinguished Secretary of the Navy, who is now the Ambassador to Mexico, the gentleman from Massachusetts

turned out to be a poor prophet, because within 10 months after his address was delivered, an armistice, a humiliating surrender, had been wrested from that autocracy about which he spoke, and we had sent into France 2,000,000 American soldiers who turned the tide of that conflict.

The gentleman speaks of a traitor. He has discovered after 10 years what no other man has discovered, and that is that the great war-time Ambassador to the Court of St. James was a traitor. What is a traitor, Mr. Chairman? I wish the gentleman had defined a traitor. I undertook to interrupt him when he mentioned the word, but he would not yield to me. I should have yielded to him had he been present here 2 weeks ago.

A traitor is one who violates his allegiance and betrays his country, and one who in breach of trust delivers his country to an enemy.

Mr. Chairman, that is a strong word—traitor. I would have been content to say nothing because history had already written its verdict as to the honor and patriotism of Walter Hines Page and as to the statesmanship of Woodrow Wilson, but because the gentleman did not see fit to yield to me for a few remarks, I am now trespassing upon the indulgence of the House.

The gentleman quoted very freely from the book by Mr. Seymour, *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*. While I might say that I have not read so many books as the gentleman, because he has had more time to read books and more years in which to read them, I happen to have read everything that he said here on the floor today. He read from page 310 of *The Intimate Papers of Col. House*, and you can get the citation from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the morning, but he stopped after he finished reading the comment of Colonel House.

I had wished to ask him if he would not read the opening sentence from the letter of Ambassador Page to Colonel House, dated London, December 12, 1914, which occurs on the same page. These are the words:

MY DEAR HOUSE: I am trying my best, God knows, to keep the way as smooth as possible.

The gentleman said that President Wilson was much put out because he thought that our Ambassador was more British than the British. May I use the words of President Wilson himself in order to answer that charge? I quote now from a message of the President, read at the memorial service of Walter Hines Page, held in the Brick Presbyterian Church, New York, April 25, 1919:

It is a matter of sincere regret to me that I cannot be present to add my tribute of friendship and admiration for Walter Page. He crowned a life of active usefulness by rendering his country a service of unusual distinction, and deserves to be held in the affectionate memory of his fellow countrymen. In a time of exceeding difficulty he acquitted himself with discretion, unwavering fidelity, and admirable intelligence.

That was signed by Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. Chairman, if there is any word that is the antithesis of traitorous conduct, it is fidelity or faithful conduct.

Of course, the President could have removed the Ambassador without embarrassment, because, as I stated on a previous occasion, the Ambassador tendered his resignation, which was refused.

The gentleman from Massachusetts also spoke of the fact that there is a tablet in Westminster Abbey to Walter Hines Page. That is not a new discovery. I quoted the remarks of Viscount Grey, who was the foreign minister under the Asquith government during the difficult period from 1914 to 1917. But there is a tablet in Westminster Abbey to another great American Ambassador from the State of Massachusetts, James Russell Lowell. I recall, parenthetically, and it has no connection, that I once spent a winter in the State of Massachusetts, and the Lowells ranked at the top. There was something that went like this:

Here's to Massachusetts,
The land of the bean and cod,
Where the Cabots speak only to the Lowells,
And the Lowells speak only to God.

As to this charge that the Ambassador was a traitor—let us dismiss that. Now as to the accusation that he was pro-British. I would like for the gentleman, who has had much

contact, more than any man in this House, with foreign offices, foreign ministers, and ambassadors, to tell us sometime what is an Ambassador for, anyway, if it is not to keep his government out of trouble with the government to which he is accredited; if it is not to develop more friendly relations between his country on the one hand and the country to which he was sent? I wish the gentleman from Massachusetts had included in his remarks the fact that Walter Hines Page was tendered the most conspicuous decoration that the British Government ever gives to a person in a similar position, and he declined that distinction. I will insert it in the RECORD. It was the Grand Cross of the Order of the Bath. He declined it because of his anxiety, Mr. Chairman, to keep himself untrammelled for his work. Out of a long line of illustrious Ambassadors that our Government has sent to the Court of St. James, Walter Page was the second man ever offered it, and the only man ever to decline it. It is by all such men the most coveted decoration.

He referred to the *Dacia* incident, as I expected he would. Time will not permit me to go into that question, except to say this: The *Dacia* was one of the German ships which was in an American port at the time war came on, and, of course, it was interned. Then it was bought by a gentleman from Marquette, Mich., by the name of Breitung, who I think must have been at least of German descent. That ship, flying the American flag, was loaded with a cargo of cotton. It had been announced in advance, and was known by all people, that it was going out as a test case. That was the most difficult period that Mr. Page had to deal with as Ambassador, because our relations with Great Britain were quite strained at the time. What would happen if the British Navy seized the *Dacia* and its cargo, destined for a German port, or for a neutral port for transshipment to Germany? It is upon the basis of that incident and that conversation that the gentleman seems to pin his charge principally. Our Ambassador did what I think any Ambassador, who wished to keep friendly relations between the two Governments, who, having had personal conversations daily for 2 years at least with the Foreign Minister, in addition to official conversations, would have done. We speak of such conversations in this House as "off the record." The suggestion was made that it would avoid complications for all of them if the British Navy did not seize that ship but let it be attended to by the French, which is what happened; and as a result of that skillful stroke of diplomacy a most difficult situation was averted. I wonder sometimes if the gentleman from Massachusetts had been our Ambassador during that period what his policy would have been in dealing with all these difficult matters.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Chairman, let me say that whatever mistakes the Ambassador may have made, that was a most difficult period. It was a difficult period for men in Congress, just as the period we have been going through has been a difficult period, and we have made mistakes. Even Congressmen are not infallible, Mr. Chairman! He kept our relations with Great Britain from reaching the breaking point. When the *Lusitania* was sunk, Mr. Page advised the President to send the German Ambassador home. If that had happened, in my humble opinion—of course, no man can predict what might have been the result of anything that might have been done—but in my opinion if that had been done, as the Germans expected, as the German Ambassador himself expected, as the German press in this country practically admitted they expected, it would not have necessarily led us into the war with Germany, but it would have shown that ruthless, autocratic, imperialistic German Government that this Government meant business.

It might have been, Mr. Chairman—in my opinion, quite possibly it could have happened—that the war would have ended 1 or 2 years earlier, saving the lives of millions of men, saving billions of treasure, and possibly saving our having to send any American boys to the other side of the water.

Mr. Chairman, my time has about expired. I have taken more time than I should have. I wish the Members of the House would avail themselves of an editorial in the United States News dated December 23, 1935, written by David Lawrence, headed "Traitor or Statesman?" This editorial constitutes the finest statement I have seen as to the facts leading to our entry into the war and the reason why war became inevitable, to use the words of the German Ambassador himself.

In closing this discussion—and for my part it is closed—I hope I can put my finger upon an editorial which appeared recently—not in a North Carolina paper, for, frankly, I suspect that an editorial upon this subject by a paper in North Carolina would have to be printed upon asbestos—this editorial appeared in a paper printed in the city of Boston, and it is in such good humor that I am sure even the gentleman from Massachusetts will have a rollicking good laugh as I read it. I have said nothing about Colonel House, because Colonel House is living and is able to take care of himself. Besides, there are other Members here who are able to take care of the colonel. But the editorial is headed "Riding the Colonel." I quote:

Civil wars being the fiercest of all, the attack of Congressman GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM on Colonel House as an "expatriated Englishman's son" who was guilty of "scandalous and perfidious conduct" under Woodrow Wilson is not surprising, although a little difficult to understand.

I interrupt the reading to say that I think the Boston Herald is not only a strong Republican organ in the city of Boston, but that it is one of the traditional Republican papers of New England.

The Congressman does not accuse the colonel, Ambassador Page, or Woodrow Wilson of having sold themselves for British gold, but, but—well, anyway, Mr. TINKHAM is alarmed in an ex-post-facto sort of way.

But why the attack on the diffident colonel as the son of an expatriated Englishman? The only difference between the colonel and the Congressman dynastically is that the latter's ancestors beat the former's to it by a few generations. It is the understanding of genealogists that Mr. TINKHAM is descended from any number of *Mayflower* passengers. A Herald writer was once unkind enough to say that a chart on the Congressman's walls, showing his ancestry, had been worn out by his incessant glances of admiration.

And who knows? The colonel and the Congressman may have stemmed from the same family tree, the resemblance between the names House and Holden being strong. There are three letters in common. George may be attacking his own kinsman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

HON. EDWARD M. HOUSE

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts shows that he has not any correct information at all about Hon. Edward M. House. Every statement he made about Colonel House being incorrect, I shall not waste my time answering him.

Col. Edward M. House is one of the patriots of this Nation. He has been the close adviser of many of the most distinguished Governors of my State for the last 40 years. He was the close friend and personal adviser of President Woodrow Wilson throughout the World War. He is now the close friend and personal adviser of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He has not in his whole life asked anything whatever from either any State government or from the Federal Government. Everything he has done in a public way, and all the valuable service he has performed for his country, he has done as a patriot. It is useless to refer further to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GEN. JOHNSON HAGOOD

I do want to mention one of the most damnable outrages ever connected with this Government that today was perpetrated by the War Department on one of the greatest major generals who ever served the United States Army. Prior to our committee holding any hearings on the War Department bill, I wrote Mr. Secretary Dern and called attention to the restrictions that are usually put about Army officers to prevent them giving their own opinion of matters about which the committee interrogates them. I called at-

tention to the fact that our committee had asked the War Department to bring before it Gen. Hugh Drum, in command of Hawaii; Gen. Paul D. Malone, commanding the Ninth Corps Area, from the Presidio of California; Gen. Lyman Brown, in command at Panama; Gen. Johnson Hagood, the able commander of the Eighth Corps Area at Fort Sam Houston; and other high officers; and, in effect, I said, "If you are going to prevent these men giving us their honest opinions, I am not going to waste my time fooling around with any hearings. We want to be able to ask them questions and we want them to give us their conscientious opinions in frank answers. What are you going to do about it?"

I have a letter in my office right now from Gen. Malin Craig, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, advising that my letter to Secretary Dern had been referred to him for reply and stating that they had withdrawn all restrictions from these high Army officers; and he said he had issued an order to them that they could give us their frank answers, their frank opinions, and their frank judgment on any matters that came up in committee.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. Will the gentleman include this letter in his remarks?

Mr. BLANTON. I am so busy in some hearings upstairs just now that I do not know whether I shall have time to go to my office for it. If my secretary is still in my office after I conclude I will have her find it, and would then insert it. If I do it this evening, I will print it in the RECORD in the next day or so.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Did the Secretary of War give his permission for these generals to give their own opinions?

Mr. BLANTON. Gen. Malin Craig in his letter stated that the Secretary of War had referred my letter to him for answer and he was answering it. It came from the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, who stated unequivocally that all of said officers were directed by him to give their own conscientious opinions freely and without any restrictions whatsoever. Then these major generals came here, and we spent our Christmas holidays in Washington holding hearings. I came here in December.

I missed all of my family reunions at Christmas time in Texas in order to help hold these hearings, which were not perfunctory in character. We wanted to get the frank opinions of these great major generals. Now because General Hagood forsooth gave his honest, conscientious opinion, the War Department says it is going to spank him. It has taken his command away from him and has ordered him to stand by subject to the orders of the War Department.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to General Malin Craig, Chief of Staff; I want to say to Secretary Dern; and I want to say to Harry Woodring, Assistant Secretary of War, that they cannot get away with this outrage. I know they have General Hagood where he cannot say a word, but I am here to say a word for him. They have started a scrap that is going to last, so help me God, if He will let me live long enough, until I see they do not put this over without punishment to themselves.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the gentleman suspect that this order comes from a higher authority?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has been in public life too long not to know just how the Chief of Staff handles his punitive orders. Sometimes when the Chief of Staff pulls off these stunts, no higher up even knows about it. But they are going to know about it. I am going to bring the facts to the attention of the President.

I will say to the gentleman from New York that in my representative capacity I will back up 100 percent every word that Johnson Hagood said in that hearing. His sentiments, then expressed, are my sentiments. It is my opinion. This waste of

public money by scores of officials not loyal to the President must stop. All of my constituents want this waste stopped. Who will deny that all this money which was spent here in Washington shaking rocks in tin cans to scare the starlings from one building to another was not stage money? We all know it was. Who ever heard of putting balloons up in trees to scare the birds from one tree to another? It cost thousands of dollars here in Washington to do that. The administration does not stand for that. It stopped it when we brought it to the attention of the President. It is the foolish, wasteful spending of the underlings who are causing criticisms to be heaped upon our great President and our administration.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I congratulate the gentleman on defending these Army officers because as a rule they are afraid to come up and say anything in these hearings. When they do say something they get the devil for it, and I think the gentleman is quite right in standing up here on the floor and defending them.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want Secretary George Henry Dern, Gen. Malin Craig, and Harry Woodring to know this, that they ought to be impeached for this and put out of office, and that comes from a loyal Democrat who has faithfully supported his party for his entire lifetime. Ninety-five percent of the people of my district would express exactly the same opinion that Gen. Johnson Hagood did. Ninety-five percent of the Democrats of my State will back up 100 percent every word that General Hagood said at those hearings.

Harry Woodring is the man who has attempted to spank a great major general, one of the ablest, one of the most efficient, and one of the most courageous major generals we have in the United States Army. It is outrageous. It is damnable. If they get away with that, Congress might just as well quit and adjourn. We might just as well adjourn Congress. We might just as well turn the Treasury over to the War Department and say, "Take it. We have taken the front door off the hinges. Put your long arms in and get all you want." We might just as well do all that if we cannot get frank expressions from the high Army officers of this Nation.

Talk about ability? Johnson Hagood has more ability in his little fingernail than Harry Woodring will have in his whole system when he dies.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you what is the matter with Harry Woodring. Get the hearings, and they will substantiate what I say. When he appeared before our committee I got after him for not punishing Major Hoffman for selling out to a parachute company.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I asked Harry Woodring why he had not taken action against Major Hoffman. This major had the last say so as far as buying parachutes for the Army Air Service was concerned. This Major Hoffman helped organize a parachute company, in return for which the parachute company gave him \$23,000 in shares of the company. He was the man who let the contracts for parachutes. The Triangle Parachute Co. advertised him all over the land as being their servant. They advertised all over the country how he was in their company. They stated our War Department had spent thousands of dollars perfecting their parachutes. They sold stock all over the country by holding up the name of Major Hoffman in the United States Army as their stock in trade.

Mr. Chairman, I brought this matter to the attention of Mr. Woodring 3 years ago. He sat there and did nothing about the matter. My committee burned him up recently when he came before us for his inaction. He did not like it, and, because foresooth Johnson Hagood is down in my State with the respect and confidence of every Texan down there, he thought he would take a backhanded slap at General Hagood because he is in command at Fort Sam Houston.

Harry Woodring, you are not going to get away with it! You have started something that you are not going to carry through, because I am going to give you the scrap of your life.

Mr. LUCKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. LUCKEY. May I call attention to the fact that, the other day, I inserted in the RECORD figures showing that the United States had paid for armament and army and naval purposes more than any other nation in the world since 1919, and yet we have less to show for it than any of the other large nations?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, may I say that if we Democrats let General Craig and Woodring get away with this, it will cost the Democratic Party a million votes in November as sure as we live. It would cause the loyal Democrats in my district, who know Hagood, who also do not believe in this waste of public money, and who want this money spent for things worth while, to have a contempt for the General Staff and our War Department for this infamous, dirty, damnable, inexcusable outrage.

Mr. LUCKEY. I think it is about time that we clean house in the Army and Navy.

Mr. BLANTON. I think it is about time for us Democrats to clean our own house, and I appeal to the President of the United States to do the cleaning.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I want you Republicans to keep out of this row.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts, but do not criticize; let me do that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am just asking as a favor if you will go to the President and to the Secretary of the Interior. Colonel Hopkins has urged the use of a certain sum of money for buildings, for instance, at Fort Devens in my district, and for buildings at other Army posts all over the country.

Mr. BLANTON. I have already paid my respects to Harry Hopkins in a speech I made the other day when I called attention to the fact that there are thousands of men in my district, patriotic men, who have skimped and denied themselves and made sacrifices and gone hungry and let their wives and little children go without shoes or clothing because they were too proud to go on relief. And Harry Hopkins will not give them W. P. A. work because they have not been on relief.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But he has already recommended this.

Mr. BLANTON. Harry Hopkins says worthy starving men cannot get work unless they have been on relief. He is penalizing them for keeping off of relief, and he is putting a premium on those who have been on relief.

Harry Woodring, I despise injustice like I hate the devil, and you had better withdraw this damnable, unjust order to Johnson Hagood, because I am after you. [Applause.]

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH].

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I give my hearty endorsement to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas in respect to the action taken concerning Major General Hagood.

Major General Hagood was invited to testify before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having in charge the Army appropriation bill. He testified in response to the request of the committee. He testified, pleading for appropriations for Army housing, and in support of his plea for an appropriation in the appropriation bill, he showed the impossibility of getting money from other sources that might be available for this purpose, but the gentleman from Texas does not go far enough. He told the committee that he could get W. P. A. money for purposes that resulted in nothing of permanent value, but for projects such as housing on Army posts he could secure no allocations from relief money. This testimony was given under examination by a committee of the House, who had the

right to require his testimony not only on facts but on his conclusions and his best judgment.

Publication of his testimony was not his act, but that of the committee who may control what they include, in the printed hearings.

For this testimony he has been relieved of his command and sent home in disgrace.

In his denunciation of this reprisal on General Hagood the gentleman from Texas indulges in shadow boxing.

He denounces Assistant Secretary of War Woodring, he speaks about the Chief of Staff, General Craig, and mentions Secretary of War Dern in passing. The gentleman could not have read the order. Let us read the order. The Army order reads:

By direction of the President.

Not a routine matter, not a staff matter, not a War Department matter, but the order reads:

By direction of the President, Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood, United States Army, is relieved from assignment to the command of the Eighth Corps Area, and further duties at Fort Sam Houston, Tex. Major General Hagood will proceed to his home and await orders. The travel directed is necessary in the military service.

Although Major General Hagood was obeying a Committee of Congress, although he had express carte blanche to give his views from the Chief of Staff, in this reign of terror he is to be disciplined by President Roosevelt because he said something which might militate against Candidate Roosevelt in the next election. Private citizens have been bedeviled about income-tax revisions going back years and years. Businessmen and banks do not dare to call their souls their own. This reign of terror of which Hagood is only one example, will be increasing all over this country from now until November. The New Deal certainly has a bad case of jitters.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. THURSTON. While the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and, as such, has all the prerogatives of that office, yet in regard to the fiscal policies of the Government, a committee, duly constituted by the Congress, has the power and the authority to interrogate Army officers or any other employees of the Government with respect to any information that may be necessary for such committee.

Mr. LEHLBACH. And an Army officer who refuses to express fully his honest views when asked by such committee, is contumacious and, consequently, more in error than making any statement which might militate against anybody. [Applause.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I want to discuss in these few moments allotted to me a phase of this agricultural appropriation bill.

At the last session of Congress an authorization was had for sea-food inspectors in the various parts of this country where sea food is produced.

In the deficiency bill this year an appropriation of \$33,000 was made for the carrying out of that authorization. Through a misunderstanding that was cut out of the deficiency bill.

Then when this appropriation bill was considered, following the fact that that was cut out, the Appropriations Committee left out an appropriation of \$80,000 for carrying out the work for the fiscal year.

I realize that it is almost impossible, certainly impracticable, to get an amendment on the floor that is opposed by the committee. But I think the Members of this House, if they understood this proposition, understood the misunderstanding that prevailed among certain gentlemen in charge of the bill, that this item would be reinstated in the bill.

So I am serving notice now that I will offer an amendment at the proper point in the bill for reinstatement of the \$80,000, and I hope that this amendment may prevail. I say

there was misunderstanding about this, and I want to point that out.

When the deficiency bill was under consideration on January 23, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] made this statement:

Since it has been incorporated in this bill, the Department of Agriculture is of opinion that perhaps this would operate as a limitation on their right to administer the act. It is an unnecessary item of the bill, and therefore ask that it be stricken out.

That was done. I have no criticism of the committee. They are my personal friends.

As I say, there was some misunderstanding; and I hope the membership of this body will not blindly go along as we are prone to do—go along with the committee and give little consideration to the legislation.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. During the past 2 years committees have come in here and recommended something and the House has gone along blindly and that is the reason we have got such legislation.

Mr. COLMER. Let me say to the gentleman that I am not interested in any partisan view of this matter. The gentleman has industries in his State, at least there are such industries in some of the States represented here by Republicans, that are interested in this matter just as vitally as I am. I am interested in the matter because I think we are entitled to have the provision in the bill. We are entitled to the inspection of sea foods just the same as the meat packers at Chicago and other places have their food inspected. It costs the Government about \$5,000,000 a year to furnish food inspectors for the meat-packing industry. We are asking here for \$80,000 for the extension of the service to sea-food packers. An opinion prevails in this country that sea food is poisonous, that it is injurious to the human body, and people will not eat it unless it has the Government stamp upon it. We are asking here for the same treatment on a limited scale that the meat-packing industry receives on a large scale.

In a letter from Dr. Campbell, the head of this department, to Senator HARRISON of my State, he writes:

I pointed out that if the opinion of Congress as expressed in the sea-food amendment of August 27, 1935, was carried out, it would be necessary to appropriate \$33,000 for the remainder of this year and \$80,000 for next year. I stated to the committee that some of the small packers of shrimp did not have inspection because they were not able to pay the cost of inspection, but that if the salaries of inspectors were paid by the Government it was highly probable that practically all shrimp packers would apply for that inspection. It is to provide more adequate protection for the consuming public, since there is always potential danger in the sale of uninspected shrimp. I advanced this added protection to the public as the chief justification for the appropriation. I also stated that it was the opinion of those who advocated the enactment of the amendment that there was the same justification for appropriating funds for sea-food inspection as for inspection in the packing of meat.

Remember this. We have an authorization for this appropriation. The Budget has submitted it with approval. What is the use of getting an authorization for a certain line of work unless we can get the appropriation to carry out that work? So I hope that when this amendment is offered at the proper time, the chairman of this committee, able gentleman that he is, considerate as he is, fair as he is, will accept the amendment. In the event that he does not, I hope that we can muster sufficient strength to put it over.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that that bill to which the gentleman refers authorizes the collection of a fee from all these people who pack shrimp and that that fee is being collected and that the inspection is going on out of that fee.

Mr. COLMER. That is not true. The original bill did authorize that kind of procedure, but the bill as amended now provides for Government inspection up to within the limits of appropriation.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wanted the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to yield further, to ask him if he and other Members of Congress who have Army posts in their district, and also the entire membership of the House, would join me in a trip to the White House to see the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, to ask them to grant the money necessary for building Army cantonments as they should be built. In some posts there are quarters that are nothing better than shacks.

I know that Colonel Hopkins last summer recommended some \$800,000 allocation at Fort Devons, which is in my district. It is now, I understand, in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, and I think that a request by Members of Congress and also the taxpayers and workers all over the country—particularly those in the building trades—would go a long way toward getting that money allocated for necessary buildings. I heartily agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] when he decried, ridiculed, and denounced the great expenditure of money for useless projects. Individually the personnel in Colonel Hopkins' office and in the field offices are very courteous and very cooperative, but a chaotic condition exists in the entire work-relief program. It is a perfect whirligig and like other New Deal schemes. As a result not only the taxpayer suffers but hundreds of unemployed. If the President and Secretary Ickes would approve the allocation for the Army-post projects, employment could be given at once, because the War Department's plans have been drawn and it could put people on the projects at once.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does the lady know there has been \$164,000,000 allocated to the Army out of the public-works appropriation bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think not recently, except in one or two instances. One, I think, for a hospital at Fort Bragg, in South Carolina; that was some time ago, however; but nothing recently.

Mr. WHITE. One hundred and sixty-four million dollars of that money is yet to be expended for Army improvements.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That may have been, but not for these projects. This is for buildings that were recommended last summer by the War Department and I am sure they were recommended prior to that. I have pleaded and pleaded in vain for those buildings. I realize the work it would give and also the great saving of money, because rent is being paid for quarters for officers and men in the towns. In some Army posts there is a great fire hazard due to lack of suitable buildings. These buildings must be erected sometime to have our Army properly housed. It is only common sense and sound business management to have relief money spent so that it will give employment and at the same time fill a real need. Every day it seems that someone is punished for expressing his opinion or for giving perfectly legitimate governmental information. The removal of Colonel Hagood from his post for expressing his opinion before an appropriations committee is the latest proof of that. Truly we are becoming more and more like Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

TOWNSEND OATH VIOLATES CONGRESSMAN'S OATH; YOU CANNOT BE TRUE TO BOTH

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, this is a nice small meeting, and possibly someone will read this in the RECORD. At any rate, it has become customary to say things about the Townsend plan. I have always been for old-age pensions and am still for them. I was among the very first to announce myself for old-age pensions in Texas. That, however, is not my subject. My subject concerns the methods of so-called leaders in Washington. Although the "plan" is rapidly passing away and will be of no moment as such in 6 or 7 months from this time, I want to make a few remarks

in a quiet sort of way about some practices here in Washington.

They have sent out a questionnaire, and I have not received one, but it is endorsed by the Townsend organization, and it says:

Will you make a pledge to support and vote for national legislation sponsored by it?

It does not say what this legislation is. They want to know in advance if you are going to vote for it blindfolded, just as they tell you. Then it says further:

Will you pledge yourself to a bill enacting the Townsend plan, leaving the detail of such legislation to the national organization of the Townsend plan, which evolved the plan and presented it to the American people?

Now, they go on to say that you must go before a notary public and swear that you will keep this as an oath to the national Townsend group. In other words, you must take an oath to the national Townsend group which is superior to your national oath of allegiance to the United States of America, which is superior to your oath as a Congressman, which is superior to the duty that you owe your country.

I am making a nonpolitical talk. I am not trying to denounce anybody; but for sheer impudence, for sheer cheek, for sheer ignorance, I have never heard such a thing in the history of the American Republic.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Could anyone who had taken such an oath qualify as Member of Congress, under the statute?

OUR OATH IS WITHOUT EVASION OR MENTAL RESERVATION—TOWNSEND OATH WOULD VIOLATE THIS

Mr. MAVERICK. No. I do not want to criticize anybody who favors the Townsend plan. They have a right to favor any plan they please, but any man that takes this oath, in my opinion, cannot qualify as a Congressman, because this is the oath which we must take as Congressmen:

I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, so help me God.

Some of these promoters at the head of the Townsend plan are so grossly ignorant of parliamentary practices and duties, so ignorant of a man's self-respect and his personal honor, that they ask you to swear that you will violate your oath in advance.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. On what authority does the gentleman say that any such language is contained in any communication that came from the official Townsend organization?

Mr. MAVERICK. I have the personal word of Raymond Clapper, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, and I have this article in the newspaper. I have checked it. He told me that he went to the headquarters and saw Mr. Clements, and saw the questionnaire.

Mr. WHITE. Do you believe everything you read in the newspapers and everything any reporter tells you? Is that right?

Mr. MAVERICK. Of course not; but this is true, and you know it is true.

Mr. WHITE. Sure, it is true.

Mr. MAVERICK. Well, I am glad to know you admit it is true.

MORE OATHS TO GIVE UP YOUR SELF-RESPECT

I am told that other questions of a grossly impudent nature were asked. They ask this:

If already a candidate, will you sign a statement agreeing to withdraw your candidacy in the interests of unity and success at the polls if someone other than yourself is endorsed for the position you seek?

Then another question:

If your answer is "yes", will you, in that event, support the candidate endorsed by the organization?

On a separate sheet set forth in a few words (not less than 200 nor more than 500) why you are in favor of the Townsend plan, and what method you intend to use to convince others to support the Townsend plan at the polls?

In other words, we are ordered to give not less than 200 words nor more than 500 words, because this group of leaders does not want to be bored by too many words.

Raymond Clapper, in the Scripps-Howard papers on Saturday, February 22, 1936, says:

If anyone knows of a more brazen attempt to kidnap national legislation in advance and hold them, signed, sealed, and delivered, he would be doing a public service to expose it.

I agree 100 percent with Mr. Clapper; and this exposes it as far as Congress is concerned.

Now, I want to make this appeal to Republicans, Democrats, Progressives, and Farmer-Laborites, that we ought not to stand for any such thing, as honest, honorable men. I am not criticizing any Member of this Congress. I do not say that a man is not honest because he is for the Townsend plan, but this group of men are misleading people all over the country for a plan which they know is utterly impossible, and are trying to bulldoze Congressmen, and we, as self-respecting men, should not stand for it. Personally, I would consider myself as a crook, as a dishonorable man, if I should sign any such oath.

I call upon all Members of Congress, whether they are for the Townsend plan or not, to denounce such tactics. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain parts of this article.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this brief time while the House is discussing the state of the Union to express my unqualified approval of the following provision in the pending agricultural appropriation bill now before the House:

Provided, That no part of the appropriations contained in this act shall be used to continue the establishment of the so-called shelterbelt project of trees or shrubs in the Plains region undertaken heretofore pursuant to appropriations made for emergency purposes.

The agricultural subcommittee, of which Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, one of the ablest Members of this House, is chairman, wisely declined to make a specific appropriation for this shelterbelt.

The additional language cited above, which the committee approved today, puts an end, in my judgment, to one of the most ridiculous and ill-conceived projects ever thought of by well-meaning but impractical officials, who actually thought they could construct a luxuriant forest belt across a part of the country where the Almighty will hardly permit a cactus to grow. They already have spent \$2,000,000 of the taxpayers' money on this iridescent dream and they were asking for a million dollars more. Ultimately the project would have cost at the very minimum \$100,000,000. Even if these gentlemen could have done what the Almighty has not done and could have brought this so-called shelterbelt into existence, it would not have affected climate or temperature, and the only benefit would have been to local people in the belt zone who would have profited by the Government's largess.

This whole scheme was fairly dripping with extravagance. A de luxe prospectus on a superquality of calendered paper and highly illustrated with pictures and maps was issued the other day entitled "Possibilities of Shelterbelt Planting in the Plains Region." It was such a high-toned looking document that I was seized with a desire to know what it cost the taxpayers, especially when it seemed to me that a Government release less ornate and less expensive would have served the purpose quite as well, so I wrote to Mr. Giegengack, the Public Printer, inquiring the cost of producing this release. His reply was as follows:

This will acknowledge the receipt of your letter of February 14 in which it is requested that you be informed as to the total cost of producing the volume entitled "Possibilities of Shelterbelt Planting in the Plains Region", and in reply I am pleased to ad-

vised that there was a total of 5,000 copies printed for the Emergency Conservation Work (Forest Service) and the total cost was \$4,011.64.

Of course, this was just the printing cost of the release. The cost of collecting and editing the material is another matter and still back of it was the cost of making a detailed study of the region, costs on top of costs never ending, it seems. Out in Indiana a mighty good farm can be purchased for \$4,000 these days and here we find the cost of a splendid Indiana farm was spent merely on one relatively small item connected with this irrational and indefensible project—the cost of printing an ornate description of it.

I am a thousand percent for the President of the United States in his efforts in the direction of curtailing expenditures, as demonstrated by his recent orders calling in various emergency appropriations. I do not hold the President to blame for all of the vagaries of impractical persons in his administration, but I do hope and pray that an early frost will come along and nip all such dreamy and impossible schemes as this shelterbelt project, to the end that with the worst of the depression over, we may get back as speedily as possible to real economy in Government which is so much needed as a basis of sound recovery. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McREYNOLDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 11418, the agricultural appropriation bill, 1937, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker and Members of Congress, permit me to make a declaration which comes from the bottom of my heart and my own convictions. The tragic and brutal assassination of Col. E. Francis Riggs in the city of San Juan should in no way reflect on the Puerto Rican people. They resent such dastardly crimes as much as you and I.

I knew personally the late chief of police of Puerto Rico, and I have yet to hear of any complaint being made with respect to the performance of his duties. I want to make clear to the Members of this body that the people of Puerto Rico are absolutely innocent of the slaying of Colonel Riggs and ought not in all fairness be connected with it. I hope that a thorough investigation will be made by Governor Winship of the background of this terrible crime, and that the responsibility should be placed where it belongs forever in order to purge any reflection which might have been made on a law-abiding people, who cherish American democratic ideals and institutions of liberty and freedom that the Puerto Ricans enjoy under the American flag and its institutions. An overwhelming majority of the people resent this crime.

We wish the respect and loyalty of the American people and hope some day to be admitted into the Union.

I beseech you to consider the people of the island in this light. We have in the island free speech, freedom of press, freedom of association, and the rights of citizenship, and these institutions must be maintained at any cost against every enemy or emergency within or without the island. [Applause.]

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I must mention again the very unfortunate death of Col. E. Francis Riggs, perpetrated by two youths. I feel constrained, as a matter of record, to transcribe a few of the comments and opinions which followed that terrible crime, something which the entire people of Puerto Rico energetically protested against and condemned.

It is true that on one hand the feeling of the people in Puerto Rico, of those who look upon with anxiety the arrival of the economic and social reconstruction of our country on the basis of true justice and the uplifting of the masses, were shocked by such a killing as that which recently took place. On the other hand, those who have created a supergovernment over the head of the insular government, and who still believe in the supremacy of a chosen few to govern the rest of the people, those reactionaries, think another way.

Puerto Rico, without those attempts at the destruction of democracy and popular representation imposing a supergovernment, will evolve as rapidly as possible toward rehabilitation without privileges for anyone or any party and most surely under the rules of our democratic institutions and the protection of the American flag. We do not have to renounce that which means our pride because of the greatness of our historical background, and we can benefit by much of that which represents human happiness to us—American civilization.

The Democratic, Socialist, and Republican Parties and the American Federation of Labor during the past 30 years have constantly advocated the obtaining by the people of Puerto Rico the decided cooperation of the Congress in Washington in order to solve the most serious problems affecting its social and economic life.

Before I continue, it is my desire again to affirm that the people of Puerto Rico, since the time of the occupation by the American Army and every year after, the Presidents and Congress have continually been requested from the nation through representatives of all our political parties and organized labor of the island to define and to set a policy for the island's future and to give recognition to the aspirations and demands of the majority of representatives elected by the people, with prospects in view for economic rehabilitation and self-government.

Unfortunately the press of the United States gives the affairs of the island scant publicity, failing to mention, among other things, the causes of disgust and indignation in Puerto Rico, and only when something like these regrettable tragedies happen is Puerto Rico mentioned.

Without doubt the New York Times has given more consideration and taken a greater interest in the economic, political, and social conditions existing in Puerto Rico than any other paper. Commenting on Colonel Riggs' assassination, the New York Times says:

The politically conscious among the 1,500,000 American citizens of Puerto Rico are tugged between two warring schools. One, represented by a majority of the island legislature, wants elevation from a dependency to a State of the United States. The minority demands independence.

Most militant among the independence advocates are the nationalists—mostly young men, some of whom carry weapons which they occasionally use. Last Sunday two of them shot and killed the chief of the insular police, Col. E. Francis Riggs, formerly of the United States Army. They did it openly, in the presence of other police, who arrested them.

In the police station they said they acted to avenge the killing of four Nationalists in disorders last October. While being questioned the killers tried to arm themselves from a nearby closet; they were shot dead.

Puerto Ricans became American citizens in 1917. But never since the United States took the island from the Spaniards in 1898 have the people been exactly sure of the form of government that would eventually be theirs. At present the islanders elect their own legislature, but not the heads of the executive departments; the President of the United States appoints the Governor and each of these two men names some of the executive chiefs, subject to confirmation by the Senate at Washington or at San Juan, as the case may be.

Washington policies toward Puerto Rico have varied with administrations. The uncertainty caused the island legislature in 1934 to petition Congress to grant statehood with a large degree of autonomy. The coalition majority, now in power in the island with 205,000 of the 388,000 votes cast in 1932, backs the statehood proposal. The chief opposition, the Liberals, have a platform declaring for independence, but do not push it strenuously.

At this point I also wish to include in my remarks some very short comments on the subject which appeared in the Washington Daily News, as follows:

The San Juan assassins who slew Col. Francis Riggs, ex-Army officer and member of a distinguished banking family here, were followers of Pedro Albizu Campos, "president" of the "republic." The men who killed a local police chief a few hours later also were identified as nationalists.

This group, which polled 5,000 votes in the last Puerto Rican elections, is represented here as an organization of patriotic zealots formed on Fascist lines rather than as a political party. It is not identified with either of the major parties—the Liberals or the Republican-Socialist coalition.

Another comment appeared as an editorial in the Baltimore Sun, as follows:

The sudden and ugly appearance of terrorist assassination in Puerto Rico will come as a profound shock to mainland Americans, who, whatever the defects of their attempts at overseas administration, have always tried to cultivate the best interests of the insular possessions and have always prided themselves upon relative success of their relationship with the insular peoples. When overseas administration is not founded upon the naked principle of colonial vassalage and brutal repression, its problems are bound to be difficult.

Under the British, both in India and in Egypt, we have seen the imperial relationship develop in precisely that way. In both countries handfuls of extremists have at one time or another reduced the political problem very nearly to the insoluble. But Americans, both of the mainland and the island, have more successfully managed to meet the unavoidable difficulties of the relationship with sanity and compromise, and mainland Americans certainly hope that they may continue to do so. The two wretched youths who murdered Colonel Riggs in San Juan and called down upon themselves what looks horribly like an application of the ley de fuga, have rendered Puerto Rico a terrible disservice, but not so great a one as that of the politicians who incited them with fantastic talk of an "army of liberation" and a "war of independence." There are only two possible answers to terrorism. One is drastic suppression. The other implies a much worse fate for the island; it is independence, which means economic and political death.

And the other was printed in the Washington Post, which follows:

The only policy which we have consistently followed with respect to Puerto Rico is one of drifting. So casually "conquered" by General Miles in 1898, the people of this island have never been advised as to what may be their final position in the American scheme—or as to whether they are ultimately to belong to that scheme at all. Meanwhile, Hawaii, with a population largely Asiatic in composition, has become a full-fledged Territory.

The uncertainty as to Puerto Rico's future political status has bred three distinct schools of thought among the islanders. One, a minority representing substantial property interests, would be satisfied to retain the present form of connection with the United States. Another and very influential group has long worked for outright statehood within the American Union. The third would have nothing less than complete independence.

The issue of independence was first openly intruded into local politics in 1932 by the Liberal Party of Antonio Barcelo. The Liberals would attain their ends by the peaceful weapons of petition and argument. However, members of the Nationalist group, composed largely of hot-headed youths, have favored a program of violence. They have apparently acted on the theory that if they make the situation of American officials on the island uncomfortable enough we might withdraw and leave the natives to their own devices.

Until recently extremist agitation had largely been restricted to displays of untamed speech. But ever since the sanguinary incident of Río Piedras last October more direct methods have been feared. The passive attitude of responsible elements in the face of this strong probability is evidence of serious negligence in dealing with the fundamental problem. Now, resort to terrorism by members of the Nationalist Party reveals a situation which can no longer be ignored.

I want to make clear to the Members of the House that the people of Puerto Rico are absolutely innocent of the slaying of Colonel Riggs and ought not, in all fairness, be connected with it, because the great majority of Puerto Ricans are law-abiding citizens, who cherish democratic ideals and the institutions of liberty and freedom which they enjoy under the American flag.

POLITICAL PARTIES

The island's political parties in existence at this time are organized in four groups, as follows:

The Union Republican Party of Puerto Rico historically represents a true spirit of Americanization of the island and maintains the fundamental principle of permanent association with the United States. This party strongly supports the ideal of the admission of Puerto Rico as a State of the Union, as recently stated in the platform of the National

Democratic Party. The total number of votes obtained by this party in November 1932 was 110,793.

The Liberal Party is asking for independence and the organization of Puerto Rico as a republic. They want also that the statehood be granted by Congress at once. The total number of votes obtained in November 1932 by this party was 170,162.

The Socialist Party of Puerto Rico is a creation of the labor organization as represented by the American Federation of Labor. Since its organization over 30 years ago as a political party, it has also maintained and supported the fundamental principle and aim of our permanent association with the people of the United States of America. The total number of votes obtained by this party in November 1932 was 97,433.

The Nationalistic Party is radically antagonistic to American institutions and advocates the immediate constitution of Puerto Rico as a free republic with no connection whatsoever with the United States of America. The party obtained only 5,254 votes at the last election.

THE COALITION

Both parties, the Union Republican and the Socialist Parties, having some common ideals, decided to form a coalition.

The total votes cast by the four political groups for the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico in Washington were as follows:

Coalition:	Votes
Union Republican.....	110,793
Socialist Party.....	97,433
Total.....	208,226
Liberal Party.....	170,162
Nationalist Party.....	5,254

The majority of the coalition for the Resident Commissioner was 38,064 against the Liberal Party.

PUERTO RICO AN ORGANIZED TERRITORY

The following decision with regard to the political status of Puerto Rico was rendered by one of the Assistant Attorneys General of the United States, in which the opinion is expressed that Puerto Rico is an organized Territory of the United States:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1934.

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. STANLEY, THE ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

I have had under consideration your request for recommendation on H. R. 7873 (73d Cong., 2d sess.) and reasons in support thereof, particularly concerning the request contained in the letter of SANTIAGO IGLESIAS, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico. I take it that the request of the Commissioner goes no further than to consider whether Puerto Rico is such a Territory as is intended to be governed by this act. I will therefore confine my consideration of the matter to that question.

If, therefore, Puerto Rico may be said to be within the meaning of the term "Territories" the act applies to Puerto Rico. It is true that Puerto Rico is not a fully organized Territory such as Alaska and Hawaii and has not been incorporated into the Union as a Territory (*Balzac v. People of Puerto Rico*, 258 U. S. 298, 305). On the other hand, it has been held by the United States Supreme Court to be a completely organized Territory.

"Puerto Rico, although not a Territory incorporated into the United States, is a completely organized Territory."

In the opinion Mr. Chief Justice Fuller said (p. 476):
"It may be justly asserted that Puerto Rico is a completely organized Territory, although not a Territory incorporated into the United States, and that there is no reason why Puerto Rico should not be held to be such a Territory as is comprised in S. 5278."

The specific question asked by the Commissioner is:
The object of this letter is to ascertain whether under the term "Territories" Puerto Rico is included and will benefit by this bill or any other bill where the word "Territories" is used.

I therefore answer this question in the affirmative.

Respectfully,

HARRY W. BLAIR,
Assistant Attorney General.

VACATIONS TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8458) to pro-

vide for vacations to Government employees, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RAMSPECK, SIROVICH, and LEHLBACH.

SICK LEAVE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8459) to standardize sick leave and extend it to all civilian employees, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us how much sick leave it is expected will be given Government employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. We are reducing the sick leave from 30 to 15 days.

Mr. RICH. For all Government employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does not the gentleman feel he is jeopardizing the legislation in view of the fact the Senate, as I understand, has given certain Senators an absolute promise that they would stand by the amendments they desire?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not think so. I may say to the gentleman I have consulted with the gentleman to whom he refers on the other side of the Capitol, and I think we shall have cooperation.

Mr. COCHRAN. It has always been my observation that when the Senate makes an agreement with certain Senators to do something they generally stand by their agreement. The gentleman might be jeopardizing his own legislation by sending it to conference.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not think so, I may say to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. RAMSPECK, SIROVICH, and LEHLBACH.

ALLIES OF THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address I delivered February 22, also to include a letter I received criticizing that address and my reply thereto, and three of four extracts from Communists' publications in regard to the same subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, by permission of the House I am offering herewith to be printed as a part of these remarks an address delivered by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System at Washington on February 22, 1936, applying especially to the McCormack-Tydings bill and the Kramer bill. The enactment of these bills into law is being vigorously opposed by the Communists.

I do not charge that all who oppose these bills are Communists, but I do believe it fair to assert that those who oppose the enactment of these bills into law are, to that extent, perhaps unwittingly, but nevertheless actually, allies of the Communists in that respect, in connection with their opposition to these bills. Mr. Speaker, I am getting too old to become excited over any question and certainly old enough to be calm, temperate, and judicial in my judgments about all matters. I hope that I have cultivated a spirit of tolerance, liberality of views, and willingness to hear and to try to understand the other man's views. I have been an ardent student of Thomas Jefferson all my life. I have read everything that he ever wrote, if the same was published in the 20-volume edition of his writings that I have, and have read most of them more than one time. But Thomas Jefferson was an individualist of the most pronounced character. Believing in the Declaration of Independence, he also believed that it implied equality of opportunity to every man and woman to make of themselves all that their ability,

their energy, and their character justifies them in making. But he also believed that ability must be stimulated, energy must be aroused, and character must be strengthened in the fierce fires of competition. Thomas Jefferson did not believe that the sluggard should eat. He believed that the man who would not work should feel the pinch of hunger. He believed that the man who would not strive to be something, to do something, and to have something should not be permitted to enjoy that which others by their labor and sacrifice produce. I take my stand upon this broad platform, and that is why I believe that this doctrine of the Communists is an enemy to the progress of the human race.

Mr. Speaker, the general public may not think there is any danger from Communists and communistic sympathizers in this country. But they are active and energetic; they are working with the zeal of missionaries; they are pushing their propaganda with fanatical enthusiasm, but at the same time discreet, prudent, and well-nigh secretive methods. That is why these Communists are so bitter in their efforts to defeat the legislation to punish those who would incite disaffection and mutiny among our soldiers and sailors. This opposition has the same source as the opposition to the Kramer bill. How any loyal, reasonable American citizen will take the second thought about the Kramer bill and still continue in opposition to it is beyond my comprehension. Do not we all recognize the wisdom and the fairness of a law that prohibits, under criminal penalties, one person to advise and urge another to commit murder, or to commit burglary, or to commit arson, or to commit larceny, or to commit any other of the hundreds of crimes, common law or statutory? Yet can there be a higher crime than the urging and inviting and advising other people to bring on civil war? The Kramer bill simply says that it shall be unlawful for one person to advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. The heart of that proposed law is the use of force and violence. We recognize the right under the Constitution of all citizens to advise and plead for the overthrow of the Government of the United States at the ballot box. Of course, the Communists of Russia would not allow any such privilege. If any person in Russia today were to speak or write advocating replacing the Soviet Government with any other government, that person would be thrown in prison immediately and perhaps finally executed. We have an accepted liberal Government under a liberal Constitution. I believe in it with all my heart.

I derive that belief from my understanding of the political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson. But I deny, and Thomas Jefferson would deny, and it seems to me that any very reasonable and fair-minded person would deny that any man should advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence, thus bringing on civil war, wholesale murder, destruction of property, and perhaps the destruction of our civilization itself. No greater crime can be contemplated. No greater act of treason could be committed. Yet some groups oppose our setting up a law that it shall be unlawful to commit this high treason by advocating civil war as a means of overthrowing our Government.

Mr. Speaker, the McCormack-Tydings bill is a corollary of the Kramer bill. Why do we spend nearly a billion dollars a year for national defense? Manifestly it is to support and defend our Government and our institutions against all enemies, foreign and domestic. In other words, our Army and our Navy are to prevent any foreign government from invading us and conquering us and forcing upon us their laws and their institutions. Without adequate national defense, the Soviet Government of Russia, with its most powerful air fleet and its most powerful armies, with adequate sea transport, could invade us and make another U. S. S. R. in good old U. S. A. Without an army and a navy to assist our civil-law agencies and officers, including our police force, our sheriffs and our deputy sheriffs, the sappers and miners within our own borders, these very Communists who openly and frankly admit that when they get sufficient strength and when the psychological moment arrives they will strike like a tiger, with all possible force and violence, at the throat of our Government, will surely seize the opportunity,

seize our broadcasting systems, seize our telephone and telegraph systems, seize our transport systems, and seize all of our public utilities, and then finally seize the reins of government itself, and within a few days set up a Communist dictatorship as tyrannical, as cruel, and as murderous as that set up by revolution in Russia.

Mr. Speaker, it seems a popular pastime in the last few years for many of our citizens, heretofore loyal, to find some fault with our Government and with our economic system, and instead of working patiently to correct it, either by amending the Constitution, or by enacting legislation under the Constitution, or by forming public sentiment to make such changes effective, they impatiently insist upon overthrowing the Government itself. It seems to me very much like burning the barn to get rid of the rats. I know our Government is not perfect, but I also know the government of Russia is not perfect. I would a thousand times prefer to leave my children and the children of my brothers and sisters in a government controlled by the will of a majority of the people, where a man may freely express himself, either in writing or by speech, upon all public questions affecting the policies and laws of his Government, than to leave them subject to an autocratic, bureaucratic, dictatorial group of irresponsible commissars never elected by the people and not removable by the people, such as they have in Russia. Conditions in Germany and in Italy are bad enough, and I am as bitterly opposed to fascism and to nazi-ism as I am to communism. I am for Americanism, under the American Constitution, which can be amended at any time. I am now pleading with those who find little faults in our governmental and economic system not to join the ranks of our outright domestic enemies, not to sympathize with their opposition to this proposed legislation, not to become their virtual allies in this particular respect, but to stand by the Government that holds wide the doors of opportunity for our boys and our girls.

Ours is a Government that says to every boy and girl that he has a chance in life to be something and to have something. At the same time our Government says to every boy and girl that if they will not work, if they will not obtain an education, if they will not become efficient, if they will not economize, then they must brand themselves as failures, and while we will not see them suffer for bread, we will grant them an old-age pension sufficient to maintain reasonable comfort, yet those who do not work and produce shall not and should not enjoy the same benefits as those who work, sacrifice, and save in order to have something in old age.

M'CORMACK-TYDINGS-KRAMER BILLS

Mr. Speaker, to make application of these general propositions to the McCormack-Tydings bill, I express surprise that so many people and so many newspapers and magazines misunderstand the provisions of the McCormack-Tydings bill, as amended by the Committee on Military Affairs. Will any editor or anybody else claim the privilege of advising police officers and firemen not to obey the laws, regulations, and orders governing them? If so, why? Why do we pay and maintain policemen and firemen? The answer is obvious. Disobedience by them defeats the very purpose of our paying them. By the same token, it must be manifest that disobedience by a soldier or sailor defeats the purpose of having soldiers and sailors. If that be so, then who should have the privilege of urging soldiers and sailors to disobey? How can it deny ordinary freedom of speech and of the press to say that citizens shall not urge soldiers and sailors to disobey? When employers, the heads of newspapers and magazines, the heads of factories, and railroads, and other industrial institutions, tolerate the presence in their organizations of people who urge their employees to disobey the rules of the industry, to do defective work, to neglect their duties, to damage the property of the employers, and thus to derange, disorganize, and virtually destroy the business of their employers, then we understand why it would be proper to let Dick, Tom, and Harry advise and urge soldiers and sailors to disobey the laws, regulations, and orders governing them.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no danger to freedom of speech and of the press from this bill as amended. The committee is scrupulously careful to respect the principle of free speech and of free press. The provisions of the proposed law are directed solely at those who say to soldiers and sailors, directly and in person, that they should not obey those having authority over them. This talk I have heard and read that to circulate Bibles, or the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution of the United States, among soldiers and sailors would constitute the person so distributing them a violator of the law, seems to me too weak and unreasonable to deceive or mislead any informed mind. There is not a word in the Bible or in the Declaration of Independence or in the Constitution of the United States that could be, by any possibility, twisted into advising soldiers and sailors to disobey orders. In fact, the Bible is full of advice to the contrary. The Bible even says that servants should be obedient to their masters. The Bible throughout, and especially in the writings of St. Paul, exalts the virtues of the loyal and faithful soldier. When the Ten Commandments say, "Thou shalt not kill", it refers, as every reasonable mind must know, to malicious killing defined as "murder", and not to killing in lawful form. Surely there are very few, if any persons, who do not believe in capital punishment for certain hideous crimes. Can it be said that the Bible forbids capital punishment? When Jehovah led the hosts of Israel in battle against their enemies, did He, himself, violate his own command to his children? All language must be interpreted reasonably and in connection with the object to be accomplished and the idea to be expressed. True, Jesus Christ is the "Prince of Peace", but I have searched carefully, through many years, his words, and in vain, to find where he condemned a warfare of defense, a righteous warfare for truth and justice. He will reign after the final triumph of truth and justice over error and sin.

Who condemns the American Revolutionary War? Who condemns the War of 1812, to enforce our rights upon the sea and to defend our infant Republic? Who says that when the British put their feet on the soil at the shores of Chesapeake Bay and were marching toward our then infant Capital that it would not have been proper for our soldiers to have destroyed the last one of them rather than permit them to destroy our Capitol, our Executive Mansion, and many other public and private buildings? Who but deplores the inadequacy of our defense, who but hangs his head in shame to think of our defeat at the battle of Bladensburg? Who but recalls with humiliation the fact that the invader drove our President and his Cabinet and all other Government officials out of the city of Washington?

SINISTER APPEALS TO SELFISHNESS

Mr. Speaker, some very strange and subtle and misleading arguments have been used to try to defeat the McCormack-Tydings bill and the Kramer bill. I hope our people will wake up and think carefully about these matters. I know how susceptible enlisted men in the Army and the Navy are to the seductive insinuating suggestions that they are unjustly and unfairly treated, and yet employed to maintain an unjust capitalistic system. As a result of this fact, the enlisted men of the Army and the Navy suffer from what is now called "inferiority complex." Their minds and hearts are thus rendered fertile ground for the planting of feelings of insubordination, of disaffection, of disloyalty, of mutiny. It would sound very plausible, it would have a powerful appeal for Communists and their sympathizing allies to remind the enlisted men of the Army and Navy, and especially the noncommissioned officers, that the leaders, the masters, of Russia, of Germany, and of Italy today, were, during the World War enlisted men and noncommissioned officers.

How powerful would be the appeal to these noncommissioned officers to promise them that, when our Government is overthrown by the Communists and their sympathizers by using force and violence, then the present generals and admirals and other high ranking officers would be displaced, would, perhaps, have to face a firing squad or flee the country, and that those who are now noncommissioned officers and enlisted men, would be in command of the armed forces

that a Communist government is certain to organize and maintain. The talk about the bottom rail getting on top is always a powerful appeal to the bottom rail. The good old English way, the good old American way, of rising from mud sill to the capstone, of advancing from the log cabin to the White House, of advancing from the sweatshop to the counting house, of advancing from the mine to the United States Senate, of advancing from poverty to wealth, of advancing from obscurity to power and influence, is the slow but sure method of competition, the fair and just method of personal ability, of individual industry and of private economy and thrift. If this system has been abused, let us correct it. If powerful business has abused its power, let us regulate it as we have done and as we are doing. If a few individuals receive too large a share of the national income, let us regulate that. But do not let us burn the barn to kill the rats.

Who would ask the legal right to advise and urge pupils in public schools to disobey the rules of the school and directions of the teacher? Who wishes the legal privilege of advising and urging cooks, chauffeurs, salesmen, trustees, cashiers, watchmen, and all employees and agents to be disloyal to their employers and principals? Then why should any person claim his rights and privileges are infringed by a law against advising and urging soldiers and sailors not to do their duty? "If any, speak, for him have I offended."

PROGRAM OF REVOLUTION IN AMERICA

The following is taken from the August issue of A Survey of Americanism, by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Published and distributed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and they assume the responsibility for its accuracy:

RED TACTICS IN AMERICA

In the National Bulletin, Military Order of the World War, is published an excerpt from a confidential report of an address given recently in one of our large cities by a Soviet agent, an emissary of the criminal dictatorship of Soviet Russia. Said this sedition-breeding gentleman:

"We are proceeding in America just as we are in Europe, and throughout the world. We Communists and Socialists will haul down the dirty American flag and fly our own red flag over the White House. We are boring from within the labor unions. We are penetrating pacifistic organizations, organizing student clubs, and planting our workers in the culture clubs of women. We are organizing to fight the Boy Scouts, the rotten breeding places of patriotism. We will infiltrate into the American Army and Navy and stamp the men with our cause. Don't think we can't do it! We will drive them like sheep before us. We will put into your legislature, into Congress, into the Senate, those who will do our work for us. Think these things over. Get America ready for its fall."

Communists are feverishly attempting to organize within the National Guard, the Army and Navy of the United States. They have made progress in that direction. While legislation has been introduced to take care of this serious situation, the red-aiding American Civil Liberties Union is bitterly opposing it, assisted by Congressmen, at least one of whom admits his membership in this organization. The foregoing are but a few of the many of the astonishing facts available, showing the infiltration of sedition, atheism, and disloyalty into our national life.

COMMUNISTS WORK LIKE TERMITES

This speech was made at a mass meeting of key men of the Communist Party and sympathizers for the purpose of developing a united front against class legislation. The speech was made by one Paul Richie, San Diego assemblyman to the California State Legislature. Extracts are quoted below:

"We're as busy as termites." Perhaps we are going to come together in a united front, but I am here to protest some sinister un-American activities being carried on by certain subversive minority groups. I refer to the Junior Chamber of Commerce, Elks, etc. [loud boos], Fascist tendencies represented by Billy Hearst. The working class is waking up. It runs the industries except in ownership. We need to study tactics for the abolition of capitalism. Must convince the capitalist class that the rotten old system don't work. Your power lies in revolutionary industrial organization. The ballot preserves your respectability; advocate a peaceful revolution. I don't say we're going to have it, but it won't be our fault if it's a violent revolution. Do you want a revolution? [Audience: Yes; yes.] Then you must nullify the military forces of the United States (or the capitalist class). Then you can say, "Shoot us if you will, but we won't make your guns." I'd like to see it come soon. I believe the revolution tradition of American people will be stirred by our plank. Try "abolition of capitalism"; freedom of speech means nothing unless you have the right to advocate the overthrow of

the Government by force and violence if you wish. [Reading bills.] "One bill denies freedom of conscience in universities, etc."

ROCHESTER, N. Y., February 22, 1936.

Hon. JOHN J. McSWAIN,

Member of Congress from South Carolina.

DEAR SIR: After listening to your talk via the radio today, I just couldn't resist the temptation to write you, and if what I say doesn't meet with your approval, please believe me when I say, at least it is an honest opinion of one who likes to think of himself as a patriotic American citizen; from the Mexican War through the Civil War, Spanish-American, and World War, my family has been amply represented.

I saw active service in France as a private in the doughboys; I might add I volunteered. I tell you this, not in the spirit of bravado, but to emphasize my claim as a patriotic citizen.

First, let me tell you I think you greatly underestimate the number of communistic sympathizers in this country. However that may be, the point I wish to stress is, instead of the bills which you have discussed, why not get at the bottom of this communistic action, find out why loyal American citizens are willing to listen to these "red" orators? If you do this, I am confident you will find that it is not so much "red" propaganda that is responsible as it is the greed and selfishness of the so-called "capitalistic class."

Unless you and your colleagues of both Houses of Congress can devise some means to stop this concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, which as you know creates untold hardship on most people, all the prohibitive legislation you pass will only serve to give these red agitators something to squawk about and thereby gain more sympathizers.

Please believe me when I say I am a firm believer in our American system of government and I sincerely hope it is never overthrown, but facts are facts, and I think you'll agree with me when I say that something is wrong with a system that permits all this wealth and splendor for some and misery and suffering for millions of others.

Find out what this wrong is, remedy it, and you won't have to pass prohibitive legislation to curb Communists. They will disappear almost over night.

In conclusion let me say, if the day ever comes when we have bloody revolution it can only be the fault of these greedy, selfish few who think that money makes right.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIS O. PEACOCK.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1936.

Mr. WILLIS O. PEACOCK,

41 Wooden Street, Rochester, N. Y.

DEAR MR. PEACOCK: I have received your letter which you volunteered to write me, and since you do not ask me to keep it confidential, I assume that you are proud of it. Accordingly, I am putting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD along with my reply.

You say that you are a patriotic American citizen and you believe in our system of government, but manifestly you sympathize considerably with the Communists. Your reference to a bloody revolution is significant, and reveals the state of mind of these Communists. They openly confess that they will hail the day with joy when bloody revolution will stalk the land, and when thousands and tens of thousands will bite the dust in death. If you are the loyal American citizen you claim you are, and if you believe in our system of government, as you profess to do, then you should set your face and influence against the Communists and join our Democratic Party in our efforts to correct, as far as possible, the injustices of our constitutional and economic system. I believe that if private persons in Russia could express themselves about the tyrannical and despotic dictatorship now prevailing in that country, millions of Russians, yea, tens of millions of them, would be writing against Sovietism much stronger than you have written against the defects of our American system. Any Government and any system will always have some defects, but I fear that the Communists and their sympathizers, of whom you are manifestly one, would burn the barn to get rid of the rats; that is, you would overthrow the system in order to correct the defects, and if thus you bring in Communism, I feel sure that you will jump out of the frying pan straight into the fire.

Yours very truly,

J. J. McSWAIN.

COMMUNIST FLAVOR HERE

The Washington Herald of December 19, 1935, reports a meeting called the National Peace Conference, which met behind closed doors, claiming to represent 29 organizations, and put out the following six-point program:

1. A Nation-wide program to have the United States enter into obligations of international action.
2. To cripple the Army and the Navy by cutting appropriations.
3. Defeat of the antimutiny and antisedition bill and the Kramer bill, which would forbid advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence.
4. Abolish R. O. T. C. in universities, colleges, and schools and begin with the entering wedge of the Nye-Kvale bill to make military training in land-grant colleges optional.

5. Vigorous propaganda for our entry into the League of Nations so that our Army and Navy might not be used to enforce League sanctions.

6. Adoption of a drastic neutrality bill, the effect of which would be economic isolation for a while but ultimately would probably mean our entry into another World War.

SINISTER SUGGESTIONS

A leaflet circulated among the sailors on shore duty signed "Shipmates' Voice", and pertaining to be published by the enlisted men in the Navy and the Marine Corps, contains the following:

WE MUST ORGANIZE FOR PEACE

Unless the soldiers and sailors and the millions of workers who would be called upon to swell their ranks in the threatening war do some thinking on their own accord and back it up with independent collective action against the war danger, the cause of peace is lost. The workers in their unions and the masses of the people in their antiwar organizations have made a good beginning. It is up to us to go along with them.

American capitalism regards the Navy as the first line of defense of its profits in time of war. It maintains the Navy to enforce the tradition of the freedom of the seas, which serves as a screen to war-profiteering trade. No more telling blow could be struck for the cause of peace than an organization of enlisted men in the Navy which would refuse to defend the profits of American business.

There are plenty of men in the Navy who are ready to support this program. Some of us are already organized into the groups which publish Shipmates' Voice. But to be really effective in the fight for peace, we must broaden this organization to include the entire enlisted personnel. Talk it up with your shipmates. Form a group on your own ship or shore station.

Join the workers' fight for peace. Not a shot in defense of capitalist war profits.

PLAN OF CAMPAIGN

A statement issued by the Communist Party at San Pedro, Calif., and circulated among soldiers and sailors and marines, addressed to them as fellow workers, contains among other things the following:

[Issued by San Pedro Unit, Los Angeles section, district 13, Communist Party, United States of America]

FIGHT THE BOSSES!

If we are to fight, let us not fight other workers! Let us join the millions of other workers to fight against our common enemy—the plundering, exploiting, bloodthirsty boss class!

Join the Communist Party, the only party which fights for full and immediate payment of the bonus, against imperialist war preparations, for unemployment insurance, against wage cuts, and lay-offs! For information write to 1164 Market Street, San Francisco.

Turn all war funds over to the unemployed and for the veterans' bonus! Demand the withdrawal of American battleships from Chinese waters! Defend the Soviet Union, the First Workers' government! War means the butchering of millions of working-class youth! Fight against imperialist war preparations! Demand "hands off China!" Defend the Chinese Soviets! Fight against the wage-cut drive of the boss class!

MISREPRESENTATION RUN MAD

A glaring example of the misrepresentations made to the people whereby they are induced to express opposition to the legislation to protect our armed forces from disloyal, seditious propaganda, is the following extract from a newspaper sent to me by a lady out in Michigan:

Under the Tydings-McCormack military disaffections bill, a person who said the Army or Navy was too large would be liable to prosecution. Indeed, the critic who said the Army and Navy are too small would also be a criminal.

The mother who advised her son not to reenlist in the Army, Navy, or marines would be committing a crime and subject to a \$1,000 fine and 2 years in prison.

How any person with the slightest intellectual honesty could so distort his imagination as to say that the McCormack-Tydings bill, if enacted into law, would make possible prosecution and conviction of any person who argued that the Army or Navy is too large or too small, is inconceivable to me. But the zenith of insincerity, of absurdity, of rank hypocrisy, not to mention falsity, is reached when they say that the bill levels its prohibition against a mother who might advise her son against reenlisting in the Army or Navy or the Marine Corps. There is no law, regulation, or order to the effect that any soldier or sailor shall reenlist. Many of the most loyal, patriotic women in the land might advise their sons not to reenlist. One enlistment for an American citizen is usually his share of military duty. There are millions stridently professing 100-percent Americanism

that not only have never in their lives done any sort of military duty, but have done all they can to evade and escape military duty for themselves and others. Jury duty, military duty, and many other kinds of public duty may be burdensome and unpleasant, but to have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, these public duties must be discharged.

I respectfully ask all of those who write and publish these tirades against the McCormack-Tydings bill and the Kramer bill first to publish the exact language of these bills as recommended to the House by the appropriate committees. If they will do that, the bitter fulminations and false representations constituting their mere comment upon these bills will fall flat in the minds of intelligent and thinking people. All that I ask is that the people be given the knowledge of the exact language of these bills.

RADIO ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE M'SWAIN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, DELIVERED OVER COLUMBIA SYSTEM, FEBRUARY 22, 1936, AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

I am venturing on the discussion of the subject of subversive communistic activities in this country, especially as relates to the Army and the Navy, with a full realization that ordinarily the subject excites so much feeling, either for or against, that it is difficult for those aroused by such feelings to reason calmly and to distinguish truth from falsehood. I am hoping to offer a calm and judicial discussion and am begging all listeners to lay aside feelings, for the moment at least, and to reason calmly and coolly.

First, let us take up the Tydings-McCormack bill, now pending in the House of Representatives, having passed the Senate and having been reported favorably by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House. It has been erroneously thought by some people that this bill in some way impinges the freedom of the press and the freedom of speech of the ordinary citizen, due to misleading propaganda.

I cannot believe that those who come to this conclusion have considered the subject quietly. We must remember that the Army and the Navy are in a special group by themselves and have something of the same relationship to the public as the police force and the fire departments. No person is compelled in peacetime to join any of these organizations, but having joined them, and receiving the benefits coming from such membership, the individuals thereby set themselves apart as a peculiar class and establish for themselves a peculiar relationship to the Government. They no longer have the freedom and privileges of civilians. Now, the bill under discussion merely proposes that any person who knowingly, and with the purpose to incite mutiny or disobedience, advises or counsels any soldier or sailor to violate the laws or regulations governing the Army or Navy, shall be guilty of a criminal offense. This is simply and absolutely all there is in and about the bill. The very essence, benefit, and advantage of maintaining an Army and a Navy, and a police force, and a fire department, rests upon the principles of absolute and instantaneous obedience to orders. If the members of the fire department were permitted to delay after receiving the fire alarm and to debate and take a vote before responding, then the house would burn down before they arrived. If the members of the police force were permitted to deliberate and hesitate and pass resolutions before enforcing the law, then lawlessness and crime would stalk the land, until civilization would be impossible. In like manner, if soldiers and sailors are to discuss and debate the questions of obeying orders in any case whatsoever, or in certain classes of cases, then the money spent to have organized force to resist invasions, and suppress insurrection, would be largely wasted.

It is no answer, I respectfully submit, to say that neither the Army nor the Navy now need such legislation. Certainly, it is no reflection upon either the efficiency of the officers or the loyalty of the enlisted personnel to propose such legislation. All of us know the facts and none of us need dispute them, that pouring suggestions, insinuations, suspicions, and doubts into the minds of people will ultimately bear fruit in action. This psychological fact is the basis for billions of dollars spent in advertising. If communistic agencies and their sympathizers are to be free to speak and to hand out literature to soldiers and sailors, telling them that the existing economic institutions are unjust and unfair, and inhuman, and that our armies and navies are maintained to support and bolster up a selfish and wicked capitalistic system, and that the real interests of the enlisted men are with these communistic agitators and against their own Government, and that when a critical emergency arises and an opportunity presents itself for Communists to overthrow the existing Government, then such soldiers and sailors should defy the law and the authority of their officers and should join the Communist revolutionaries and should turn their guns against the Government that has been paying them, feeding them, clothing them, and housing them; if such propaganda is to be permitted, then the very condition that communistic agitators so ardently desire may ultimately come about. History is constantly repeating itself in different parts of the world, and I find that the communistic literature is full of suggestions about the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, and the German Revolution, and hints are many about a coming world-wide revolution at the first opportune moment. All education, all propaganda rest upon the uni-

versally known fact that thought, ideas, sentiments finally bear fruit in action.

Now, note well, the prohibitions and penalties proposed by the Tydings-McCormack bill are directed exclusively against those who conduct such propaganda among the personnel of the Army and the Navy, and such propaganda must be under the amendment proposed by the House Committee on Military Affairs, be specifically and directly addressed to and knowingly and purposely aimed at such personnel of the Army and the Navy. If the speech or literature be addressed to a general audience of civilians and if incidentally the propaganda comes to the ears or eyes of the soldier or sailor, that would not constitute the offense. Therefore, all newspapers would be absolutely free and all speakers would be absolutely free to print or to say anything in favor of the communistic government and anything against our own democratic Government that they saw fit. It certainly is a high evidence of the toleration and liberal-mindedness of the American people that they do permit under their Constitution agitators to speak and to write sentiments and suggestions directly aimed at the overthrow of this Government and thus directly calculated to bring on civil war and to destroy the institutions that have made America great and upon which I believe her future greatness, power, and prestige must rest. I am wondering if a communistic government, such as prevails in Russia, would permit any speaker or writer to say or write anything critical and calculated to overthrow the Soviet regime, and proposing to establish a capitalistic system in Russia. I am informed it would not be tolerated one second.

Undoubtedly, there are some people in America who believe in the system of economics and the government now existing in Russia. Just how many I do not know, but they are certainly turning out a considerable volume of literature in the form of newspapers, pamphlets, magazines, and books. I wonder if their ideas should prevail, and ultimately they should be able to overthrow our American system and to set up in America their Russian system, if then they would permit any person to propose a return to the former American system and the overthrow of their Russianized and communistic system? I venture to say they would not and that either the prison or the firing squad would be the fate of all who dared to speak honest convictions to the effect that our good old American competitive system, based on private property and personal liberty, was better than any imported system based on communism, whereby private property would be destroyed, personal liberty wiped out, and all the people regimented in every detail of life by laws that they dared not question nor defy.

Now let me take up the Kramer bill which is also pending in the House of Representatives. This bill too has been misunderstood and misrepresented. All and simply all that it proposes that any person who advises the overthrow of the existing American system of Government by force and violence shall be held guilty of a criminal offense. Is there anything dangerous in such a proposal? Is it not essentially in the interest of public order and of human life and liberty? Mark you, the language does not say that it shall be against the law to advise a change from the existing system to some other system, such for instance, as communism in Russia.

The inhibition is directed against advising the use of force and violence to make such change. In other words, and reduced to its last analysis, it means that people shall not be permitted lawfully to advise insurrection, rebellion, and civil war, with all their horrors, sufferings, and destructive forces. We agree that all persons have absolute freedom under our Constitution to argue that our Constitution may be amended in any way the requisite majority wishes to amend it. Therefore the requisite majority may legally so change our Government that it will cease to be a government regulating a competitive economy based on private property and shall become a communistic or socialistic government, abrogating private property and wiping out personal liberty. If those holding such views can get enough votes in the ballot box in a peaceful and legal manner, then their will must prevail. But the Kramer bill says that you shall not advise and urge the people to use force in order to bring about the change. Every individual is invested by God Almighty with the right of self-defense. Every government is invested with the right of self-defense, and the government which does not lay a penalty against advising and preaching violence, internecine strife, fratricidal slaughter, and civil war would certainly not be taking adequate measures for self-defense.

Some persons say that concern and anxiety about the presence and spread of communistic sentiment in America is not justified. Some people tell us that the number of Communists is too small; that there are only 30,000 in the United States. However, there is a much larger fraction of the population, while not openly avowed Communists, who sympathize with and have many ideas in common with the Communists, and are willing to exert their influence to protect communistic propaganda. Too many good Americans join such organizations. The net result of this situation is that even in our colleges and universities, and in the studies of certain dreamy, theoretical, impractical people, claiming to be the intelligentsia of America, even in some pink-tea drawing rooms, as well as in low dives and disreputable places, also among some submerged minorities, unduly class conscious and seeking opportunity for any change in the social order, there are perhaps hundreds of thousands who bear different organizational names, but all actually give aid and comfort to the philosophy of communism, and thus indirectly help the avowed Communists to overthrow our Anglo-Saxon institutions and to set up a communistic soviet society.

Those who smugly assure themselves that there is no danger from all these subversive sources may some day meet a rude awakening.

Though I have not hunted down any communistic missionaries, yet knowledge of their presence and activities in many places has been thrust upon me. From this knowledge, I feel safe in asserting to my fellow American citizens that an actual, deliberate, and thoroughly organized secret campaign for spreading disloyal sentiments and subversive teachings among the sailors and soldiers of America is today going on. Generally the Army and naval officers do not know about these things any more than they know about the private lives of their men. How can the officers tell with whom sailors and soldiers associate while off duty, and while strolling around the streets and alleys of the great cities? One soldier or sailor converted to this dangerous, disloyal thinking becomes the efficient emissary to induce many other soldiers and sailors to accept the same false doctrines. Thus they are advised to wear citizens' clothes while off duty and while attending the conferences and sessions of these hellholes of disloyalty. Their whispered program tells them to await the great day of decision and action. They are told by these Communist agitators to continue to accept the pay of the loyal taxpayers of this Nation, to eat their food and to wear their clothes, and to pretend to be their defenders. But these Communists have a deliberate, well-concealed and firmly fixed plan to cooperate with their traitorous conspirators in the civil population, and when the time is deemed ripe by the autocratic leaders of this school of traitors, they will seek to take possession of our forts, fields, and arsenals; to seize our stocks of food and clothing, to man airplanes, machine guns, cannon, and rifles, and following the commands of some American Stalin, they will turn against organized society in America all the instrumentalities of warfare that we have built up at great expense to defend ourselves against enemies, foreign and domestic, against invasion from abroad and insurrection at home.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. LORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], on February 22, at Alexandria, Va.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LORD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein an address delivered by my colleague, Representative CHAUNCEY W. REED of Illinois, to the members of Alexandria-Washington Lodge No. 22, A. F. & A. M., on the occasion of their celebration on February 22, 1936, of the birth of George Washington.

Brother Toastmaster, Most Worshipful Grand Master, distinguished guests, ladies, and brethren, meager indeed is my command of the English rhetoric with which I must needs express the satisfaction that is mine in the rare privilege this evening to address you, the members of Alexandria-Washington Lodge No. 22, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, on the anniversary of the birth of your first worshipful master. Tonight, throughout these United States, millions of citizens of this great Republic, which he founded, are seated by the firesides of their homes, and through the medium of radio are listening with rapt attention to eloquent tributes that are being broadcast through the air concerning the life, character, and distinguished services of this great man. Although more than 200 years have passed since he first saw the light of day, a grateful Nation seems never to tire of a recital of the incidents and accomplishments of his eventful life. It is a story that will never grow old.

To you, however, is accorded the privilege of meeting this day each year to honor the memory of a brother, who, although dead, is bound to you by a tie stronger than human hands can impose. In flesh and blood, he mingled and associated in fraternal comradeship with your older brothers. He guided the destinies of this lodge in its infancy and relinquished that trust only after there had been thrust upon his shoulders the responsibility of blazing the trail for a new Republic of which he was the acknowledged leader. I realize how futile must be my poor effort to discuss with this audience and in these surroundings the life and the character of the man—George Washington. He was born in this vicinity. He lived most of his life here. Many of the distinguished services he rendered to State and Nation were accomplished within a few miles from where we are now assembled. Anecdotes of incidents in his personal and public life are well known to all of you. You, and each of you, have been familiar since early childhood with the scores of historic landmarks that still remain to remind us of the long-ago struggle for freedom in which he played so important a part. Your lodge is rich with priceless treasures that continually emphasize to you with a mute eloquence more potent than words, his character as a Mason, a soldier, a statesman, and a man.

Like all great men, George Washington was blessed with a good mother. Not much is known of the girlhood of Mary Ball Washington. She was born in 1708 and lived in Westmoreland County, Va. She is said to have been a girl of rare beauty, and at the age of 18 was known as "the Belle of the Northern Neck." At the age of 22 she married Capt. Augustine Washington, and 2 years later the Father of his Country was born. Washington is

said to have resembled his mother in many ways. From her he inherited his features, calmness, and dignity.

During the Revolutionary War she knitted constantly, making garments for the soldiers. When news was bad she would often say, "The mothers and wives of brave men must be brave women." On one occasion of bad news when her daughter Betty Lewis gave a cry of despair, she murmured, "The sister of the Commanding General must be an example of fortitude and faith." When news of victory at Trenton reached her and the neighbors were congratulating her on her son's victory, she said, "George is apt to succeed in anything he undertakes. He was always a good boy." After the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown she was in attendance at a jubilation ball at Fredericksburg. One of the French officers observing her and learning her identity exclaimed, "If such are the matrons of America, she can well boast of her illustrious sons."

As a surveyor in early life, George Washington entered the wilderness of Virginia and Kentucky and there, through hardship and peril, gained the knowledge that enabled him in later years to save the army of General Braddock from annihilation. The French and Indian War provided him with the opportunity to develop his natural military ability and assert his character of leadership. So universal was the knowledge of his prowess that hardly had the echo of the shot at Lexington ceased its reverberations when the American people called him to Cambridge and he received the sword never to be sheathed until he had won the War of Independence.

As a general, Washington was truly great; not merely for the things he did but also for the things he didn't do. He knew his soldiers. He appreciated his resources. He comprehended his enemies. He realized the odds that were against him. He knew when it was advantageous to fight and when it was wisdom to retreat. He was keen to grasp opportunity when within his reach and when he struck it was with all the energy, dash, and daring of which he was capable. Never will the brilliance of that achievement be dimmed, when, in a blinding snowstorm, amidst huge cakes of floating ice, he and his army crossed the Delaware and vanquished the unsuspecting foe at Trenton. And then again at Monmouth when, through the treachery of Gen. Charles Lee, the retreating and demoralized troops were about to surrender a well-earned victory, it was Washington who dashed at their lead and, through his personal magnetism and appeal, victory was snatched from defeat. At Princeton, too, the inspiration that must have permeated the ranks when their leader, scoffing at danger, led his troops into the thickest of the fight, was largely contributory to the victory that crowned his valor.

Too numerous to mention are the instances of sorrow, of despair, of intrigue, of conspiracies, of jealousies, of discouragements that fell to his lot during that awful winter at Valley Forge. It was here, during the darkest hour of the Revolution, that a private soldier is said to have seen his Commander in Chief drop to his knees in the snow and, lifting his eyes to Heaven, ask Divine guidance from Him in whom he had put his trust. His prayers were answered. A powerful foreign nation proffered its assistance. A brilliant military stratagem on the part of Washington culminated in the surrender of the British Army at Yorktown.

The struggle for independence was at an end. Peace was declared, and the political ties that bound the colonists to the mother country were forever severed. America was born. It was then that General Washington bade farewell to his officers and men and went back to spend what he thought would be a life of retirement and rest. But he was not long to remain in seclusion. The new Government was functioning badly. It needed strength. It required permanence. It lacked stability. A convention to remedy its faults was called in Philadelphia. Washington was chosen a delegate. The men who constituted that Convention were the most able and brilliant men in the country at that time. General Washington was their unanimous choice to preside over their deliberations. Only once did he take the floor, when he advocated a larger representation in the lower House of Congress. But the influence he wielded as presiding officer and the realization by the delegates that he and only he would be the one chosen as Chief Executive in the Government that was to be, had much to do with the approval and ratification of that bulwark of American liberty, the Constitution of the United States, which Gladstone described as "the most wonderful document ever struck off at a given time by the brain of man."

On February 4, 1789, the electoral college by a unanimous vote chose him President of the United States, and on April 30 of that year constitutional government began with his inauguration. For 8 years Washington remained at the helm of government. He demonstrated that kings were not essential to the proper control of the affairs of state and that orderly administration could best be attained when the people themselves ruled under and by virtue of delegated authority. As President it became his responsibility to maintain in peace that which he had acquired by war—the independence of his country. To accomplish this end he steadfastly insisted upon the enforcement of law, the maintenance of public credit, and the avoidance of entangling foreign alliances. This latter policy outlined by him was subsequently declared by President Monroe as the recognized doctrine among the nations of the world.

Refusing a third term, he returned to his beloved Mount Vernon to pass the remainder of his years. He died December 14, 1799. On the day following his funeral, Timothy Pickens, speaking in the United States Senate, said: "With patriotic pride we review the life of our Washington and compare him with

those of other countries who have been preeminent in fame. Ancient and modern names diminish before him. Greatness and guilt have too often been allied; but his fame is whiter than it is brilliant. The destroyers of nations stood abashed at the majesty of his virtue. It reproved the intemperance of their ambition and darkened the splendor of victory. Let his countrymen consecrate the memory of the heroic general, the patriotic statesman, and the virtuous sage; let them teach their children never to forget that the fruit of his labors and his example are their inheritance."

Men in public life are always the targets of those who seek to gain selfish ends through the missiles of abuse and ridicule. Washington was no exception to this rule.

In December 1799, during the final months of his last administration the Philadelphia Aurora, a fiery, partisan publication, edited by a grandson of Benjamin Franklin said, "If ever a nation was debauched by a man, the American Nation has been debauched by Washington. If ever a nation was deceived by a man, the American Nation has been deceived by Washington." And later upon the occasion of his retiring from the Presidency this same publication announced editorially: "We rejoice at the ending of a career of one who carried his design against the public liberty so far as to have put in jeopardy its very existence."

Thomas Paine that same year in an address, directing his remarks to the retiring Chief Magistrate of the Nation shouted, "As to you, sir, treacherous to private friendship * * * and a hypocrite in public life, the world will be puzzled to decide whether you are an apostate or an impostor; whether you have abandoned good principles, or whether you ever had any."

These utterances and the characterizations of aristocrat, tyrant, anglo-maniac, monarchist, embezzler, crocodile, and even hyena, were hurled at him from all sides by fanatical, idiotic, and yet frantically sincere partisan political opponents.

Time has effaced all these unkind allusions to him whose memory we honor tonight, for, like the ever-changing tempest of the deep, they came, they lashed, they raged, they subsided, they shifted, and departing left behind them only a calm and tranquil sea. Reference to them is available today only through perusal of the musty files of long ago.

But sometimes I wonder if the living George Washington was more cruelly maligned than has been the dead George Washington. We Americans are prone to adapt ourselves to the movement of a pendulum. We go from one extreme to the other. We are apt to abuse and vilify a good man during his lifetime, but when he dies we honor and glorify him. With Washington we seem to have gone a step farther. We have stripped him of his attire of reality and clothed him in a mantle of unreality. In other words we have attempted to transform him from a real human, robust man to a supernatural man. When a small boy attending public school I was taught that George Washington never told a lie. It is difficult for the average schoolboy to imagine the creation of a human being who always tells the truth. He looks at his companions, his teachers, and even his parents and fails to observe in them the same flawless character as that of the man he has been taught to revere and who he has been told could not tell a falsehood. A few days ago, when reading some of Washington's letters, I chanced upon one which he wrote to a man after a trip through New Jersey in which he said "the New Jersey mosquito can bite through the thickest boot." In another letter "I announced that I would leave at 8 o'clock and immediately gave private orders to go at 5 so as to avoid the throng."

At Valley Forge, during the darkest period of the war, when no supplies were available, he issued an order to his men, a portion of which read as follows: "Thank heaven, our country abounds with provisions and prudent management. We need not apprehend want for any length of time."

No, Washington can hardly be classed as a supernatural. He was intensely human. He had his faults and imperfections the same as we have. He too had his weaknesses and his failings. Who among us can feel dissatisfaction over his characteristic natural temper which blazed forth at Monmouth when he denounced the recreant General Lee in language distinguished by its force and vigor, rather than its saintly perfection.

He was not a divinity; he was a man. A red-blooded, passionate, forceful man who thought, dreamed, and aspired. A man who could swear and a man who could pray when occasion demanded it. Sincere, modest, upright, humane. An all-around man with whom his fraternal associates could meet upon the level and part upon the square. He was first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen. His renown cannot be added to or diminished. It will shine with refulgent splendor as long as America remains a Nation of people. Apt, indeed, were the words of Abraham Lincoln when he said: "To add brightness to the sun or glory to the name of Washington is alike impossible. Let none attempt it."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein extracts from an article to which I shall refer. I have an estimate from the Printer.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how long are those extracts?

Mr. WHITE. My speech and the extracts will not amount to four pages of the RECORD.

Mr. TABER. How much space will the extracts take, about half?

Mr. WHITE. About half.

Mr. TABER. That is too large a proportion. If the gentleman will cut it down to a quarter, I shall not object.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the gentleman will bear in mind that I do not ask this privilege often nor do I take much time on the floor.

Mr. TABER. I shall have to object if half the extension is going to be extracts.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GRAY of Indiana, for 1 week, on account of illness.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union resumes further consideration of the bill H. R. 11418, the agricultural appropriation bill, that time for general debate shall not exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THURSTON], and myself, at the end of which time the bill shall be read for amendment.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Speaker, that is satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3. An act to regulate commerce in firearms; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 536. An act for the relief of Ada Mary Tornau; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2188. An act for the relief of the estate of Frank B. Niles; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2336. An act granting compensation to Mary Weller; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2517. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Navy of Walter M. Graesser, a lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2747. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear the claim of the Canal Dredging Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2869. An act to legalize the use of emergency-relief funds for the construction of armories for the National Guard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 2922. An act for the relief of Rose Stratton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3125. An act for the relief of J. A. Hammond; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3161. An act to amend section 13 (c) of the act entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, etc., approved March 3, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 3257. An act to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 3333. An act for the relief of DeForest Loys Trautman, lieutenant, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 3367. An act for the relief of James Gaynor; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3395. An act to authorize the acquisition of the railroad tracks, trestle, and right-of-way of the Gulf Power Co. at the naval air station, Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 3514. An act to regulate the manufacture, dispensing, selling, and possession of narcotic drugs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 3655. An act for the relief of the Vermont Transit Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3663. An act for the relief of William Connelly, alias William E. Connoley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3761. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to patent certain land to the town of Wamsutter, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3777. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to execute an agreement of indemnity to the First Granite National Bank, Augusta, Maine; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3860. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to amend the National Defense Act", approved May 28, 1928; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3872. An act for the relief of the present leader of the Army Band; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 11138. An act to extinguish tax liabilities and tax liens arising out of the Tobacco, Cotton, and Potato Acts; and

H. J. Res. 488. Joint resolution to provide for safeguarding of traffic on Military Road.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 11138. An act to extinguish tax liabilities and tax liens arising out of the Tobacco, Cotton, and Potato Acts; and

H. J. Res. 488. Joint resolution to provide for safeguarding of traffic on Military Road.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 25, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

678. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, for the fiscal year 1936, amounting to \$4,250 (H. Doc. No. 415); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

679. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 19, 1936, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of channel from Back River to public landing in Wallace Creek, Elizabeth City County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. GREENWOOD: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 427. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 11047; without amendment (Rept. No. 2060). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 11418. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2061). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7090) for the relief of Leonard Gramstad; Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8011) to extend the benefits under the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to Ethel Boyd; Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 10343) granting a pension to Lou Satterfield; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 11418) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 11419) to establish additional national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H. R. 11420) to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 11421) to amend the National Firearms Act by extending its provisions to pistols and revolvers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 11422) to reimburse certain persons whose animals were seized in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania because of tubercular infection; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREGORY: A bill (H. R. 11423) to authorize a compact and agreement between the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia, providing for the control of the production of dark-fired tobacco in the said States and for the further purpose of regulating, protecting, and preserving a fair price for said commodity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KNUTE HILL: A bill (H. R. 11424) to provide for an adjustment with the State of Washington to satisfy the grants made to said State for school and other purposes in accordance with the provision of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A resolution (H. Res. 427) providing for the consideration of H. R. 11047, a bill relating to taxation of shares of preferred stock, capital notes, and debentures of banks while owned by Reconstruction Finance Corporation and reaffirming their immunity; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution (H. Res. 429) providing for the investigation of labor conditions in the mining and tunneling industries; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolution (H. Res. 430) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to transmit to the House of Representatives a complete and unexpurgated copy of the report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics relative to the cotton-reduction program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 496) for the erection of a memorial to Dr. Samuel Alexander Mudd; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DISNEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 497) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Petroleum Exposition, Tulsa, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERGUSON: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 43) to direct the joint committee on internal revenue taxation to recommend measures imposing on procession appropriate taxes equal to amounts returned to processors as a

result of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Agricultural Adjustment Act case; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 11425) for the relief of Gustava Hanna; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 11426) for the relief of Arthur P. Foster; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 11427) for the relief of John N. Paulson; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. COSTELLO: A bill (H. R. 11428) for the relief of Robert William Morris; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CROWE: A bill (H. R. 11429) granting a pension to Elmer Goldman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULKIN: A bill (H. R. 11430) granting an increase of pension to Kate Riker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11431) granting an increase of pension to Cora A. Townsend; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 11432) for the relief of Felix Griego; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H. R. 11433) for the relief of Jennie May Lee; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11434) for the relief of Tom Kelly; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11435) granting a pension to Lena Edna Pollock; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11436) for the relief of Mrs. Charles R. Warner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GASSAWAY: A bill (H. R. 11437) for the relief of W. Cooke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLLISTER: A bill (H. R. 11438) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Kaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11439) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Parish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11440) granting an increase of pension to Lulu H. Powers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11441) granting a pension to Emma Ferris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11442) granting a pension to Mary E. Hilles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 11443) granting a pension to Ellen Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PFEIFER: A bill (H. R. 11444) for the relief of the parents of Benjamin Muzio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: A bill (H. R. 11445) for the relief of Dorsey Costello Rosier; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 11446) for the relief of Estell Gregg; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 11447) for the relief of James M. De Witt; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SADOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 11448) for the relief of Charles Bubyak; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHANLEY: A bill (H. R. 11449) for the relief of Rose Stratton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11450) granting compensation to Mary Weller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 11451) for the relief of Philip Sadow; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10237. By Mr. AYERS: Petition of Walter F. Steeves and 76 other citizens, of Livingston, Clyde Park, Willsall, and Cradbourne, Mont.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10238. Also, petition of L. R. Anderson and 33 other patrons of star route no. 63366, Nibbe to Wanetta, Mont.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10239. By Mr. DRISCOLL: Petition of patrons of star route no. 10219 from Oil City to Fertigs, Pa., petitioning Congress to enact legislation to indefinitely extend existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon to an equal basis with that paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10240. By Mr. FOCHT: Petitions of citizens and patrons of star route no. 10560, reaching from McConnellsburg to Everett, a part of the Eighteenth Pennsylvania Congressional District, for legislation to extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10241. Also, petitions of citizens and patrons of star route no. 10550, reaching from Harrisonville to Orbisonia, a part of the Eighteenth Pennsylvania Congressional District, for legislation to extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10242. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Junior Birdmen of America, of the Washington Wing; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10243. Also, petition of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10244. Also, petition of the Minnesota Bar Association; to the Committee on the Library.

10245. By Mr. BIERMANN: Petition of citizens of Calmar and Decorah, Iowa, asking for remedial legislation regarding star mail routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10246. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of the laborers of Bayamon, P. R., favoring an amendment to the Organic Act in order that a public-welfare department may be created in Puerto Rico; urging that Puerto Rico be included in any new legislation in regard to relief which might be presented in the House of Representatives; and requesting an extension of the benefits of the Federal Social Security Act to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10247. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of the Parent-Teachers' Association of the Grade School of Wyncote, Pa., in support of bills which provide for Federal motion-picture commission to supervise production, distribution, and exhibition of pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10248. Also, petition of the board of supervisors, Jefferson County, N. Y., favoring the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10249. Also, petition of the Ladies' Auxiliary of the New York, Ontario, and Western Veterans' Association of the Northern Division, Norwich, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 3263; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10250. By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of the Pulaski Memorial Committee, Bronx, New York city, in support of the naming of a Navy destroyer the *Pulaski*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

10251. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of the Railroad Employees and Taxpayers Association of the State of New York, Chenango Unit, favoring House bill 3263 (Pettengill bill); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10252. By Mr. FORD of Mississippi: Petition of L. Harrison and 99 other citizens, of Grenada County, Miss., asking for remedial legislation regarding star routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10253. Also, petition of M. R. Langston, State president of the Star Route Carriers' Association, and four others, favoring remedial legislation regarding star routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10254. By Mr. FULMER: Memorial of the House of Representatives, South Carolina Legislature, memorializing Congress to refund to the farmers the tax paid under the Bankhead Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10255. Also, resolution of the House of Representatives, South Carolina Legislature, to memorialize Congress to ap-

propriate necessary funds for returning Paul Redfern from the jungles; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10256. By Mr. PFEIFER: Telegram of M. C. Keveny, president, Local 4, National Federation Federal Employees, New York City, concerning annual and sick leave bills; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

10257. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the directors of the Oil and Gas Association of Michigan, endorsing House bill 10483; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10258. Also, petition of the Michigan Bakers' Association, Inc., protesting against any bill in Congress designed to impose any additional tax to replace the processing tax, whether retroactive or not; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10259. By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of the Fontana Utopian Group, No. 72 A-12, opposing the exporting of any war materials or any such commodities which can be used to sustain a military organization of any foreign power which is waging a military campaign against another country or countries, and demanding the enforcement of the present embargo act, recently proclaimed by the President of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10260. By Mr. SISSON: Petition of Joy MacLean and others of Sauquoit, Oneida County, urging the passage of the Kerr bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

10261. Also, petition of patrons of star route no. 7250, from Knoxboro to Oriskany Falls, N. Y., petitioning for enactment of legislation indefinitely extending all existing star-route contracts and increasing the compensation thereon to an equal basis with that paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10262. By Mr. STEFAN: Petition bearing the signatures of 59 citizens of Niobrara and Santee, Nebr., asking the Congress to enact legislation at this session to indefinitely extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon to an equal basis with that paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1936

(Legislative day of Monday, Feb. 24, 1936)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, February 24, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	Keyes	Overton
Ashurst	Coolidge	King	Pittman
Austin	Costigan	La Follette	Radcliffe
Bachman	Couzens	Lewis	Robinson
Bailey	Davis	Logan	Russell
Barbour	Dickinson	Lonergan	Schwellenbach
Benson	Donahay	Long	Sheppard
Bilbo	Duffy	McAdoo	Smith
Black	Frazier	McGill	Stelwer
Borah	George	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gibson	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	Glass	Maloney	Townsend
Bulow	Gore	Metcalf	Trammell
Burke	Guffey	Minton	Truman
Byrd	Hale	Murphy	Tydings
Byrnes	Harrison	Murray	Vandenberg
Capper	Hastings	Neely	Van Nuys
Caraway	Hatch	Norbeck	Wagner
Carey	Hayden	Norris	Wheeler
Chavez	Holt	Nye	White
Clark	Johnson	O'Mahoney	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] are absent

from the Senate because of illness, and that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. POPE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 399. An act to amend sections 416 and 417 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia; and

S. 3035. An act to provide for enforcing the lien of the District of Columbia upon real estate bid off in its name when offered for sale for arrears of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the bills (H. R. 8458) to provide for vacations to Government employees, and for other purposes, and (H. R. 8459) to standardize sick leave and extend it to all civilian employees; asked conferences with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RAMSPÉCK, Mr. SIROVICH, and Mr. LEHLBACH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the respective conferences.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3254. An act to exempt certain small firearms from the provisions of the National Firearms Act;

H. R. 8886. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the founding of the city of Columbia, S. C.; and

H. R. 10975. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of Marshy Hope Creek, a tributary of the Nanticoke River, at and within a few miles of Federalsburg, Caroline County, Md., with a view to the controlling of floods.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 9130) to authorize the incorporated city of Skagway, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, and for such purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$12,000, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

PROPERTY IN CUSTODY OF DISTRICT PROPERTY CLERK

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 399) to amend sections 416 and 417 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia, which were, on page 2, line 7, after the word "sale", to insert "having been retained by the said property clerk for a period of 3 months without a lawful claimant", and on page 2, line 7, after the word "shall", to insert "then."

Mr. KING. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

ARREARS OF TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS IN THE DISTRICT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3035) to provide for enforcing the lien of the District of Columbia upon real estate bid off in its name when offered for sale for arrears of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes, which were, on page 3, line 11, to strike out "pass" and insert "enter"; and on page 4, line 18, after the word "by", to insert "the."

Mr. KING. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.